

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1869.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE SCHOOL.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE relation of Christianity to science has been made the subject of earnest and learned discussion in every age since the former became a living power in the world. We propose to discuss the subject on its more practical side, with reference especially to the circumstances under which Christianity is working out its problem in this country. In order to do so, it seems proper to glance briefly at the history of the church in its relation to the school.

In its first entrance into the world, Christianity soon found itself arrayed against all heathen systems of philosophy and learning, as well as against all heathen systems of idolatry. Heathen learning, in its last results, was one with heathen religion. Both were destitute of the true light which had come into the world, in the incarnation of the Son of God. Common education must ever receive its reigning spirit from the character of the higher order of culture that prevails. Hence while the first fathers and theologians fought the battle against heathen science and philosophy, the Church undertook immediately to provide for the education of her own children. The form in which this was done at first was catechization. The young in

every parish were divided into different classes of catechumens. The general division was between the baptized and unbaptized, and these again were subdivided into different classes. About the middle of the second century we read of the school at Alexandria, which, it is true, became more of a philosophico-theological Seminary than a catechetical school proper, yet it stands as a witness of the deep interest the Church took in the education of her sons. The same is true of the school of Antioch. Of course, it was a necessity at first that Christian children should acquire the rudiments of learning in heathen schools, but this was accompanied by most careful instruction in the family and catechetical classes, to counteract the baneful and dangerous tendency of these schools, until the Church had the power and was prepared to control them. This took place, of course, as soon as the civil power fell under the control of the Church. From that time forward the work of education continued in all its departments to be of a christian character. Indeed we may say, that the Church was the only power that saved and revived learning and culture, amidst the overwhelming avalanche of barbarism that rushed down upon the Roman Empire, and threatened to blot out all trace of refinement, of science and art. We need not refer particularly to the agency of the Church in the rise and progress of the great European Universities. From these fountains the whole domain of educational work, so far as it was carried on and made general, received its character and strength.

After the Reformation a great change took place in the relation of Church and State. Indeed one of the elements of strife that entered into that great movement was just the protest and opposition of civil rulers against the authority of the pope in the civil order. The struggle between the spiritual and temporal power which had gone on for centuries, with various fortunes, though generally leaving the Church master of the situation, ended now as to its old form in the new era that was ushered in. The Protestant Church started with no power or disposition to rule in the civil order; but unfortunately in many cases the State assumed unwarrantable control

of the Church. Hence in the countries of Europe there exists still an abnormal union of Church and State, so that the former is still far from being free in its operations. Yet in this combination the Church exerts, more or less, a controlling influence in the schools. In Prussia, from which we have largely obtained our model for the public school system, Christianity in a positive form enters into their instructions. The catechism is taught as regularly as grammar or geography, and the school-master is under the direction of the minister, though both are also servants of the State.

In this country the problem comes before us in a new and different aspect. Church and State commence here as distinct and separate interests, in a way which, we think, will in the end promote the best interests of each. Yet, it is true, that their present separation can only be regarded as freely preparing the way for more full coöperation in regard to all those interests of man in reference to which they occupy common ground. We regard it as a startling fact that the interest and work of education in this country have been allowed so generally to go forward without the direct agency of the Church. In the earlier times of our history, before any general system of education was devised, the Church was accustomed to look after this interest. The first schools in this country were what are now called private, or select-schools. The people directly provided for the education of their children, and as the early settlers were to a large extent members of the Church, provision was made directly for their religious training in the schools. These schools were, according to the custom of the countries from which the early colonists emigrated, conducted under the immediate auspices of the Church. The school-house even in New-England, as well as in the Middle and Southern States, was built along-side the Meeting-house or Church. The school-master was expected to be a religious man, a member of the Church, and to perform his duties very much under the supervision of the minister. It was not dreamed in those early times that education should be divorced from the Church. From the fact that the early colon-

eis were, for the most part, established from religious motives, all social interests were largely ruled by the Church. Church and State were virtually, and in some cases formally, united, and the Church here was the ruling power.

As the colonies, however, grew into states, and finally into a nation, Church and State became separated. Under our free republican institutions, where every man is a sovereign, it was soon felt that all the citizens should be educated. Accordingly the State at once set about making provision for this end. The system of public schools was inaugurated, and the attention of our wisest and best statesmen was directed to making it efficient and complete. This was considered one of the most fundamental necessities for the prosperity and perpetuity of a free State. Without it, republican institutions could not succeed. Ever since, the American public-school system has been regarded as the pride and glory of the nation.

This system has been inaugurated and carried forward to its present state of efficiency, not without earnest protest on the part of Christian men. Though the opposite spirit has ruled, yet many earnest minds in the Church have felt all along, that in an interest in which Church and State have a common work to perform, the former should, in some form, be represented. A large number of the children in our public schools are not only inchoate citizens, but also children of the Church. They are to be trained not only for the duties of citizens but also for the higher duties of the Christian. Here was a palpable, flagrant, wrong, which many felt and deplored.

Certainly no one can complain of the State for attempting to educate its own citizens. On the other hand it deserves commendation and praise for what it has done in this respect. Nor can any one censure the State for not making its schools, in the full sense, Christian schools. Civil government has not been called, nor has it the power, to minister in the sphere of grace. It cannot authoritatively teach the Scriptures, nor can it administer the Sacraments and Ordinances of our holy religion. The most that the State can do is, to recognize the office and mission of the Church, and direct her, where it has

the power, as in Europe, or invite her, as would be the case in this country, to perform her proper functions in the schools. As to inviting the Church to coöperate directly in the conduct of the schools in this country, the civil government could make the plea, that the Church is so divided, and the interests of her divisions so conflicting, that it would be almost, if not quite impossible, to obtain any assistance from her. Which of the various denominations shall teach the Scriptures in the schools? Which shall come among the children with the rule of life and the sacred ordinances? Besides, even if Christian Churches should agree as to the form of coöperation in the schools which would suit their interests, how would the matter affect Jews and unbelievers generally?

If the matter were pressed, we believe the conclusion would be, that civil government in this country does not propose to teach religion in any form, and cannot, therefore, consistently, teach even true and sound morality, for this latter is based on true religion. In this view, we regard the plea, that Christianity in some general form can be introduced into our public schools on their present base, that the Bible can be read, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer repeated, and such subjects of a religious character introduced as the Churches are generally agreed upon, as vain. Whatever might be done incidentally here and there in this way, the theory of the system rules it out, and hence no advantage of a permanent character can be gained. Yet for all this we have no accusation to bring against the State for not doing what it cannot do of itself. All that it can do is to see and acknowledge that *its* system of education is dangerously incomplete, and therefore inefficient for training the young to be good citizens. It is as much the duty of the State to acknowledge the authority and mission of the Church, as it is the duty of the latter to recognize, and teach obedience to the former.

What we do complain of, and what we regard as a startling fact is, that during all this time the Church has done so little directly in the interest of general education. She has coolly stood aloof and allowed the State to take her little ones from

her bosom, and train them up in a step-motherly way. The only exception to this remark is, the work the Church has performed in the higher institutions of learning. Moved, at first, by the necessity of having educated ministers she has indeed, in some cases with liberal munificence, endowed theological seminaries and colleges. To the Church is the public indebted for establishing and maintaining the College-system in this country. And we gladly concede the religious influence which has been thus brought to bear upon the whole interest of education. In this sphere the interest of science in its highest form, in philosophy, has been guarded from falling over entirely into the hands of infidelity. But even here the Church has by no means done her full duty. Our colleges are only partially under the care of the Church. Except in a few strictly denominational colleges the Church does not undertake in these institutions to teach authoritatively the positive doctrines of the Christian religion. They may use the Bible in some sort as a text-book, but as to catechism or creed, through which the truths of Scripture come to a form as the teaching of the Church, they are for the most part entirely unknown. There is preaching in our colleges, but with few exceptions the Sacraments are not administered as well. But even at best our colleges are only a part of an educational system in which the Church is most deeply interested.

Shall the Church look only after the young men who have reached the collegiate department, and pay no regard to those of her sons in the Academy and Grammar School? Shall she allow the great mass of her children, who are educated only in the public schools, to pass out of her care and control, so far as their education is concerned? And shall she allow her daughters in seminaries for young ladies to be educated to a large extent apart from her direct presence and care? These are questions which press for a satisfactory answer.

One answer given by many is, that there is no need of any religious instruction in the week-day school because the Church attends to this interest on Sunday, and also through the week in Christian families. According to this view, the two interests

of religious and secular education are so separate and distinct, that each can be carried forward in this way. And the State, finding that its own system is wanting in a most serious respect, sometimes appeals to the Church to come to its rescue. Thus a short time ago, the active and efficient superintendent of public schools in Pennsylvania, Prof. Wickersham, acknowledged, at a convention of Sunday-school teachers held in Lancaster, that the training of the State-schools needed the influence of the Christian religion, in order to carry out the true idea of education. He sought to find the solution of the difficult problem in the Sunday-schools. Let them be properly organized, graded, and made truly efficient, and the system of education among us will be rendered complete. This acknowledgment from a State Superintendent of Public Schools is highly significant. It shows that even among the friends and advocates of the public school system it is felt that the State alone cannot properly attend to the whole interest of education. It shows, moreover, that something more is needed than merely the general moulding influence of Christianity to preserve our popular system of education from infidelity. The Church, in a direct and positive way, has a work to perform. Sunday-schools, at least, as a part of the educational machinery of the Church, must come to the rescue, and save the week-day schools from their downward tendency.

But this evidently is not enough. It is not sufficient that the State educate during the six days of the week, and the Church only one day. The Christian religion is a religion not only for Sunday, but for every day. Can the Church allow her children to live in the atmosphere of the world all the days of the week,—have their associations with children of unbelievers, pursue their studies in schools where no positive religious influence confronts them, and expect that all will be made right by an hour's religious instruction on Sunday? This view goes on the supposition that the Christian religion pertains only to one department of our nature, and therefore can be satisfied by giving it only one portion of our time and attention. As though what is called secular learning can be complete in itself,

and its wants fully attended to apart from Christianity in any form, and then the Church may come in to complete the work by adding her religious instruction. The two orders of our life, the religious and the secular surely are not thus related. The latter, to be true and complete in its own sphere, requires the constant presence and benediction, at all points, of the former. No, this will not answer the case, as all must readily see and feel.

Another answer to the difficult problem already hinted at, is, that the best we can do is to go forward and infuse positive moral and religious influence into the schools. Let those who find fault with them in their present condition, do something to improve them. Let ministers and christian families generally put forth efforts to bring them under the power of Christianity. Let Boards of Control introduce works on moral science, and select teachers of at least good moral character, and thus seek to make the best out of them.

If there were no other solution of the problem, this certainly would be better than nothing. But the very unsatisfactory character of it is, to our mind, sufficient to prove that we cannot rest in it. The very announcement of such an effort by the Church would awaken suspicion, and it would soon have to be decided whether such attempts to introduce Christianity into the schools is not against the system itself, and the laws by which it is controlled. Here, we think a difficulty would soon arise. In some communities, especially the German, where the people generally belong to the Church, and where the traditional feelings that Church and schools ought not to be separated, it might be done, but even there it would have to be done rather by concession than by right. Any one might raise an objection, and it would be difficult to set it aside. As to the teaching of any positive moral science, we have already urged, and we repeat it, no system of morality can be sound which does not stand in living union with Christianity. To attempt any other is to give up the question of introducing the Christian religion into our schools. To try to make it such without positively asserting its Christian foundation would be less than the Church

has a right to claim for her own children, and for unbelievers would be only an evading of the issue.

We must seek, then, some other solution of the difficult problem. How is the Church to assert her proper functions in the system of popular education in this country? We assume that this is desirable. It is coming to be felt more and more that education in itself is not necessarily a good. The old German doubts and suspicions on this subject are being felt to carry with them some force, and to be not merely the result of ignorance. New England smartness is not enough to sustain a nation. It is a power, but it may be a power to disintegrate and destroy, as it certainly will be where it is united with no sound morality.

Indeed this is revealing itself in more ways than one, as our nation is confronted more and more with the spiritual problems that concern its mission. The guiding minds of the nation may be scholars and philosophers, but if their political philosophy be not of a truly Christian character, even though it come in this garb, the ship of State will soon be stranded on the fatal shoals, or dashed headlong against the destroying rock.

We assume that our present separation of Church and State, as distinguished from the abnormal and forced relation in which the two are held bound together in Europe, is a legitimate and proper advance on previous history. We would not go back to the old, when as in the palmy days of Roman power, the State was made a mere slave of the Church, or where as in the Protestant State-system of Europe, the Church is employed as a mere function of the State. We look for a free union of Church and State, in which each shall be able to perform its proper work, as institutions having one God for their author, for the good of our race. And the present separation in this country is only a preparation for this end. Clearly the one needs the other. What would our State be without the Christian Church in these United States? What would have been its fate in the late struggle for existence, if the Church had not proclaimed, often indeed passionately and indiscreetly, that the powers that be are ordained of God? What would become of the oath, and

marriage, and the day of rest, those guardians of morality, without the Church? As the Church and the State each recognize the authority of the other in reference to these common interests or institutions, so we hold there must be a common ground on which they must meet and coöperate on the subject of popular education, and that mutual coöperation must be of a different, more intimate, character than we have found in the solutions already noticed. We are not satisfied that the State should have the week and the Church the Sunday in this work, nor that the Church should, as it were surreptitiously, attempt to infuse some vague general influence into the schools. We want far more than this; and we believe the day is coming when the State will be glad to invite more, for it needs it full as much as the Church.

Our principal concern at present, however, is for the Church. What shall she do in order to have proper control over the education of her own children? Let there be, we answer, for a time *a more marked antithesis* between the two, the Church and State, in order to a more intimate and yet free union hereafter. The State is already sufficiently marked and prominent in the work of education. It needs educated citizens and it sets about earnestly and actively to educate them. Let the Church do the same. She needs that her children shall be religiously educated, that their training shall be wholly guarded from the secular and profane. Let her set about doing her own work.

Let our colleges, those at least that are under the exclusive care of Christian denominations, be made more positively and fully Christian. There are two problems, falling indeed very much together, which a Christian college is to answer. One is in relation to the character and tendency of science in general. Upon our colleges depends the direction which is to be given to science in the form of philosophy. This may be infidel or Christian. If it be not truly Christian, the whole tendency of science as it is made to confront the minds of students will be dangerous and injurious.

But colleges are concerned directly with the personal cha-

acter and well-being of the young who are gathered to enjoy their instruction and training. A very important period of life is passed in them by those who are entrusted to their care. It is a period during which character is undergoing formation. That this may be formed aright, it is necessary that the students should be brought to stand within the influence and power of the Christian Church. In most cases they are required to attend divine service once on Sunday in some church in the village or town in which the college is located. In some, they are supplied with preaching in the college chapel. But in how few are they brought into the warm life of a congregation, in which the full power and activity of a Church are felt! For this purpose the college should be at the same time a Church, where not only the word is preached but the sacraments also dispensed. Some one or more of the professors should be charged with pastoral care over the students. They should find in their literary home all the care and attention which they would receive at the hands of a faithful pastor in that home from which, with all its hallowed influences, if a Christian home, they are now separated. Positive religious instruction should be imparted to them, not with a merely scientific interest, but with direct reference to their spiritual well-being. In the college chapel there should be not only a pulpit or desk, but also an altar. Each session they should gather around it to partake of the holy communion. All this would be of immensely more account than what is ordinarily done in these institutions in a religious way, even where it is customary to have what is called a revival now and then.

All this could be without the presence of setarianism in the bad sense. It would hold up before the minds and hearts of students the Christian Church, but the Church is a Catholic institution, founded by Christ with its word and sacraments, and its obligations are of binding force upon all men. Those who should chose to stand aloof from it could do so, of course, but they would have to do so in the face of its admonishing presence. If the world should be moved to establish colleges in which there would be no Church, let it be done. We do not

believe the Christian civilization of this country would venture thus to array itself against the Church, but if it should, it would only serve to bring out in contrast the two orders of education, an issue not to be shunned. As it is, every respectable denomination has its own college, and the religious bias of all could be satisfied. Those who have no religious status would have to be satisfied with pursuing their education under the influence of a Church institution. Without dwelling longer here, we merely raise the question why it is so generally considered proper and pious to introduce a part of the Church's functions, *preaching*, into our colleges, while the other equally essential part, the *sacraments*, is left away?

Next to the colleges are the Academies or Boarding Schools. Into these are gathered a large portion of the youth of the land. They are also generally established under the auspices of some Christian denomination. They generally seek to proclaim that the moral and religious interests of those confided to their care are properly attended to. This is regarded as a very necessary part of their commendation. Even parents who make no pretension to being Christians themselves, yet desire their children to be trained under Christian influence. Church schools are well patronized on this account. Even Roman Catholic schools have been sought out for this reason by many Protestants. Parents have admired the discipline which, it is thought, their churchly character guarantees. We feel assured that the same would be the case with any Protestant school which is conducted under a positive Churchly influence, without being narrowly sectarian. Denominational differences are lost sight of in the earnest desire of parents that their children shall be religiously educated.

Yet it is a notorious fact that even here where the Church is untrammelled by contact with any school law of the State, but few schools have ventured to make themselves *Church schools* in the full sense of the term. They are more cared for in this respect, it is true, than the common schools, but they are, as a rule, not Christian, if to be Christian requires, as a necessary article of faith, the presence of the Holy Catholic Church with all her

essential functions. For here, as in the case of our colleges, it is only one side of the Church, the preaching of the gospel, that is made to confront the students, and this generally not in the institution proper, but in some neighboring church or churches which they are required to attend. With the holy sacraments they are not familiarized as a necessary part of Christianity, conceded to be such by universal Christendom.

Here, then, is a field open to the Churches. Nothing hinders their occupying it. Why should they not at least provide fully for their own children, so that when, in the most interesting and critical period of life, they are separated from pastoral care at home, they may enjoy it, in its full power, in the Boarding School? How many of her own children are lost to the Church, just because during the period of their education, running through two, three, and five years, sometimes a longer period, they are left to so large an extent, uncared for as to their relations to the Church. None will deny this who takes into conception of Christianity the fact of the Church. With those who can rest satisfied with that kind of Christianity which leaves this out of view, which sublimates it into a mere phantom, we have no room just here for controversy.

It may be urged, here again, that schools of another kind, which either profess to teach no religion, or to teach a religion without a Church, would be established in opposition to these. So let it be. We would rather see the issue made, than that the Church should be ruled out altogether. If it were once properly made we believe one step would be taken towards a wiser and better consideration of the whole subject than we have yet had. The order of grace, if it be a supernatural order at all, must assert itself as such before it can properly be acknowledged and enter into the stream of the world's life in any form. That kind of marriage with the world which rules out one of its leading features, and makes it to consist merely in a refined theory or system of morality, will prove fatal in the end to its own highest interest.

The cry comes out from all portions of the Protestant Church for ministers. Young men crowd into every avenue of busi-

ness, and fill up every profession, while there are hardly enough entering the ministry to fill the places of those who are removed by death? Why is this? There is more than one reason which we might name, and which would bear discussion. We submit whether one may not be found just here. What is there in our Boarding Schools to instil or foster a desire to enter the ministry? Are not our sons rather educated away from the holy calling? Has not the order of our education become so alarmingly secular that the kingdom of grace is turned into a far off shadowy realm? And is not this just one of the results of ignoring the Church in which this kingdom is made to confront the young in a real form?

Without pursuing this part of our subject further, we proceed to inquire what the Church is to do in reference to the public schools, in which the larger number of her children are educated.

Here doubtless lies the most difficult part of the problem. We would utter no tirade against the Public-school system, nor would we present impracticable visionary schemes. This system in its own sphere has doubtless done much good. We would not call it heathen in the sense of ancient heathenism. There is a sense in which these schools may be called Christian, as was urged by Prof. Wickersham, who seems to at least realize the importance of the problem involved, in that those who send children to them are generally Christian people. They do not, at least, teach systems of idolatry. Indirectly and incidentally much Christian influence surrounds them and enters into them. Their teachers as a class are upright, and very many of them Christians. But with all that may be urged in their favor, it must be conceded that the Christian Church, as concerned equally with the State in the education of the young, does not connect itself with them as the State does. And those who would doubtless differ much from us in our view of the case, are casting about to know how to remedy what is defective. We are pleased with the freedom with which the subject in this aspect is now discussed in educational conventions. We do not believe the difficulty is insuperable. Under our free in-

stitutions, if the people of a community are united in their wishes, we see nothing that would necessarily hinder them from introducing into their schools, under the school law, positive religious instruction. At least it is given out by those who ought to know that this could be done. But the difficulty is that in no community, or in few communities, are the people thus unitedly disposed. The Church and the world are both represented, and the children of the world claim the right, under the law, of being left free from any Church entanglements.

What can the Church do here? We answer, until some proper adjustment can be made, if it can indeed be made, let the Church look to the establishment of *parochial schools*. The idea is not new, but it is none the less true because it is old. In theory it is conceded by the churches generally to be good. There is hardly a congregation or parish that would not prefer a school for their children, under the supervision of the Church, to the public school. They would prefer that their teacher should be a Christian, trained religiously for his work. They would be glad to have their pastor visit and direct in its operations. They would be glad to have their children taught day by day in the Bible or catechism, or both. But they shrink from the antagonism that would thus be established with schools of another character. Then the expense is an important item. They are taxed for the support of the public schools. They could not afford, in addition, to support their own. Such would be the objections urged. And perhaps the chief objection of all would be, that by this course the Church would give up altogether the State schools to the world, and thus lose the prospect of making them in any sense Christian.

We believe, notwithstanding all these objections, that it is the wisest and best policy for the Church to put itself thus in antithesis with the world by establishing parochial schools. If society generally comes to see and feel, after a while, that the Church ought to combine with the State, in some way, in the conduct of public schools, let the antithesis come to an end. But we do not believe this will be realized until the Church first lay hold to the matter with earnestness and vigor, and as-

sert her functions with reference to the education of her own children. We believe especially that this is needed in order to place a check upon the intense worldly spirit that now rules in the schools, as well as in all departments of life. For it is in this form, after all, that the spirit of our public schools stands in antagonism with Christianity. The atmosphere in which they move is altogether worldly. The whole scope and aim for which they educate is bounded on all sides by man's natural life. The sphere of the spiritual, as that in which alone this life can come to its true and proper meaning and destiny is left entirely away. There are different degrees here, it is true. The worldly life may not be limited to the interests of the merely physical side of man's nature. It may rise higher than merely pecuniary interests. It may seek to educate the mind for its own sake,—may advocate the culture of his æsthetical nature, urge the cultivation of good manners and morals, but still it owns no supernatural world, as really brought to man by the new creation in Christianity. Here it is that the Church, if she would maintain and prosecute her vocation in the world, must break with the order of the world's life. And here it is that she needs above all to surround her children with that atmosphere in which alone they can grow up in their true character.

Now let us consider the practical force of the difficulties in the way of thus entering upon an education of her own in the form of parochial schools.

In regard to the matter of expense, we would not have a greater difficulty to meet than has been met, for instance, for years, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, where the churches independent of the Establishment maintain themselves in addition to the regular tax required of them for the support of the established religion. It is somewhat of a burden to them, but they bear it cheerfully for the sake of the great interest, as they believe, involved. So, also, if the interest of the Church and our children require it, this burden also can be borne. But we believe that if this were undertaken by the churches generally, the State would feel called upon to allow

them their proper share of the taxes. This would be no more than just. Thus the Church would be acknowledged, and attention would be directed to some adjustment which would satisfy the interests of both. This is the point which we would see reached, and which we do not believe will be reached so long as the Church, as such, stands aloof. There would be poor children whose parents would not be able to incur any expense, above the small tax now imposed, for the education of their children. But could not those who are blessed with wealth provide for such? Certainly there would need to be no difficulty here.

But even if parochial schools should not be universally or generally established, yet we should not, therefore, refrain from attempting anything. One or two even of such character in a town would accomplish a good work. They would hold up before the community the sacredness of the interest involved, and be a standing witness for the Church.

As to the other objection, that the State schools would thus be given over to the world, we need only say, that the Church cannot help that if it cannot be avoided. She is to guard the interest of her own children first, and if the world is left alone, it ought to lead that world to seek for admission into her fold. But this need not be the case. Good men would feel an interest also for these world schools, and as much could be done for them at any rate as is now done for schools generally. Would that the Church could be brought to make the trial in a serious and earnest way.

In order to be successful, provision should be made for suitable teachers. These should be trained for their work. They should devote themselves heartily to it. It would be a noble sphere of labor. Many who now see in the work of teaching no moral purpose or end, and regard it only as a stepping-stone to something else, would make it the work of their lives. And there would be those, male and female, who would be willing to do so without regard specially to remuneration. The churches would make provision for the destitute, and a work would be accomplished which would tell upon all her interests.

But, it may be said, it is not consistent with the genius of Protestantism thus to separate the secular and religious orders of life. According to Protestantism, Christianity must enter into the world's life, become one with it, in order thus to mould it aright. It is only Romanism that thus antagonizes the two orders of life. This we grant. But there must be antagonism before there can be true union. Christ thus antagonized His religion with the world. The early Church came first in conflict with heathendom. And even those two institutions, the Church and State, which own a common author, though in different senses, God, require just such antithesis in order to a true synthesis.

In this country we are preparing for a new solution of the difficult problem involved in the relation of these two to each other. Thus far, in the matter of popular education, the State has been almost the only active factor. Christianity has been honored and respected, but the *Church* has been but little recognized. And she never will be recognized until she assert her presence and prerogatives. Let her do this, and we believe, the State will not refuse her most reasonable claims.

Then, too, the Church will feel the necessity pressing upon her from a new direction, to seek to attain some tangible unity. This has been felt to some extent already. In the matter of Sunday-schools this necessity has called out a union literature, which we regard, indeed, as in the main a failure, because the Churches did not properly realize the nature of the work called for, because only a portion of them are represented in it, and because she had not yet reached that unity which is necessary for such a literature. Accordingly we would not consider the Church as prepared just now to propose unitedly just what she needs in the day schools. To attempt this at the present time would, we think, result in a failure. Better would it be for each denomination, for the time, to provide for its own schools. But we might hope that this would lead to something better. The question of Church union presses now with increasing force on its own merits. This common work would only give it still greater power. Churches would feel more than ever, that as

the State is one, and confronts the Church with a definite system, so on the other hand the Church should be one, in order to meet the State in this common interest.

Our great danger in this country has been, and now is, that we take the existing status of things in Church and State as finally settled. Doubtless our basis of freedom is right, but we are as yet only in a formative period. It could not well be otherwise. Never before in history has the problem of Church and State presented itself as it does in this country. They stand here apart, each one enjoying its own measure of freedom. But their relation to each other is such that they must come together at various points in the way of coöperation. Hence questions of adjustment must continually arise. As an illustration of this, take the case of the right of the State in times of war to draft ministers to serve in the army. No nation in Christian times had done it before. The United States without ceremony asserted the right and exercised it. We believe the nation committed a sin in doing so, but the Church, as a whole entered no protest, and consequently the question of right did not seriously arise. Suppose, however, that the Church as a whole had taken a stand against the claim, it is clear that this question would have had to come to some adjustment, which would be in accordance with right, and not merely with might. The manner in which the government treated those religious bodies which are conscientiously opposed to taking up arms, shows that it is ready to consider what is just to the rights of all concerned. And we believe its decision in regard to ministers would have been different, if the Church itself had taken a proper position.

Now we regard the work of popular education as one of those questions in which it is only necessary for each to assert its prerogative in order to prepare the way for a proper adjustment. But this requires time. Were we to attempt to settle the question before the necessary data are present, we would be liable to fall into grievous error. The public-school system is regarded, indeed, by many as a model of perfection. They imagine that it is settled and fixed in its principles for all coming

time. Such a view, however, only gives evidence that it is hastily formed. Our nation is too young as yet to expect that she has even had the necessary conditions presented for the final settlement of such important problems. We need patience to wait, and a teachable disposition that we may be guided aright. The forces of history flow together in this country in such a manner, as to lead the wisest and best to tremble in view of the momentous problems that are here to find their solution. We cannot return to any old-world scheme that will answer our purpose in such a case. Neither the Roman Catholic theory, which always tends by inward necessity to unduly subordinate the State to the Church, nor the Protestant alliances of Church and State in Europe, can answer our wants. We need a new adjustment, suited to the advanced stadium of freedom upon which we have entered. We need be in no special haste to arrive at a conclusion. It accords with the American spirit to act quickly and promptly, but on this account we often have to reopen important questions for new adjustment. Let us not seek to be hasty, in this. Let the Church as a whole first awake to its high and responsible work in the education of the young, especially of her own children. Let her at the cost of any amount of labor seek to perform her duty. For the time being, let her do it apart from entangling alliances with the State. Let her see to it that in all her institutions of learning the presence of all her functions may be felt. Meanwhile there need be no collision. No one need array himself against the State for striving to do its work in its own way. Then, when the Church has properly asserted her prerogative as an institution of Him who is Head over all things, and whom Kings and princes must at last acknowledge and obey, the way will be open for a new system of popular education in which Church and State shall harmoniously perform their functions, and the odium which now attaches to our common school system will be rolled off.

THE ANGELS.

BY REV. MOSES KIEFFER, D.D.

THE word Angel is of Greek origin, and means a messenger one sent. The Hebrew word, translated angel, has the same meaning. This term is somewhat indefinite, and for this reason some have supposed that the doctrine of the angels does not properly belong to theological science. But this objection is without ground, because we find that many of God's creatures are named not so much according to their specific nature, as their peculiar activity and employment. For instance the Greek name of man means one who turns up the countenance. So our English word man, evidently taken from the Latin word "*mens*," means one who thinks. So the word angel as applied to a distinct order, or class of rational beings designates a peculiar kind of activity from which the character of the acting agent may be easily inferred.

In sundry Scriptures the term is applied to human beings. For instance in Gen. xxxii. 3; Numb. xx. 14; Prov. xxiii. 17; Luke vii. 24. "And Jacob sent messengers (*Maleakim* Angels) before him to Esau, his brother." "And Moses sent messengers from Kadesh to the king of Edom." "A wicked messenger falleth into mischief." "And when the messengers of John were departed," etc. "I will send my messenger." Thus Prophets and Bishops are called sometimes *Maleakim*, or angels, (See Haggai i. 13; Mal. ii. 7; iii. 1; Math. xi. 10; Mark, i. 2; Rev. i. 20; ii. 1, etc.) "Then spake Haggai the Lord's messenger." "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." "Behold, I will send my messen-

ger, and he shall prepare the way before me." "For this is he of whom it is written; Behold, I send my messenger, &c." "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches." "Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write." These scriptures teach us that God may employ men as messengers, but they do not yet teach us that there is an order of intelligent messengers distinct from men. For proof of this doctrine we must examine another class of Scripture passages altogether. Those of the Old Testament must be compared with those of the New. It has been said that in the Old Testament we find evident traces of the angelic doctrine; and that it is fully established in the New Testament. We shall find that there is truth in this remark if we follow the law of interpretation which requires that the doctrine be studied in its living connection with the presence of Christ, in whom the entire word of God finds its meaning. We proceed to gather up, therefore,

1. The principal Scriptures which prove that angels are personal creatures.

2. The Relative Position must be considered, which the angels hold in the created sphere of existence, or their employment; And

3. Their history.

- I. From Gen. iii. 24, we learn that God placed cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden to guard, or keep, the way of the tree of life. In reference to this passage some make the admission that it does not contain the angelic doctrine. Taking it by itself the admission may be justified. But when taken in connection with other scriptures which speak of the cherubim in the heavenly state as an order of beings next in rank to the seraphim, the passage is not without value. Then in the very outset we meet with beings who glow with heavenly light and heavenly love. A cherub is something more than a figure of different forms. As a figure is the external form of an idea, so here the cherubim with sword in hand imply living angels, holy and *intelligent*, whom God employs to keep the way of the tree of life. That tree of life is Christ, and only intelligent beings can keep, guard, defend the way of this tree.

From this it follows, as said by Dr. Ebrard, that we must not conceive of the images of the cherubim on the mercy seat, as the images of beasts. These are the images of intelligences who honor the Lord with their presence. For be it remembered Christ is the true mercy-seat, (see Rom. iii. 25,) "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood." See also 1 Sam. iv. 4. "So the people sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth between the cherubim; and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were there with the ark of the covenant of God." 2 Sam. vi. 2. "And David arose and went with all the people that were with him from Baalé of Judah to bring up from thence the ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth between the cherubim." Isa. xxxvii. 16. "O Lord of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubim." These then are holy intelligences dwelling in the immediate presence of *their* Lord, and our Lord. This sublime truth that angels dwell with and accompany our Lord is of frequent occurrence. Thus in Gen. xviii. 1, 2, 3. When the Lord appeared unto Abraham in human form two other men accompanied him, who (in Gen. xix. 1) are called *Maleakim*. As the Lord in the form of a theophany appeared to Abraham as the angel of the covenant, so the two angels, who visited Lot in Sodom, proved themselves to be more than men. They strike the riotous inhabitants with blindness, and effected the deliverance of Lot and his family, declaring that they were sent to destroy the city.

By reading these narratives carefully and studying the character and activity of these *Maleakim* it becomes quite clear that they are intelligent beings, not residents of our earth, but of heaven — possessing greater strength than men; yet obedient to the will of God. In a parallel line with the above stands the sublime language recorded in Isa. vi. 1, 2, 3. "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the *Lord* sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim; each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his

feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried to another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." This is the language of *rational* beings, who know God their creator, who heartily love him, and glorify and praise him forever.

Here we must not fail to notice Jacob's vision of the ladder, reaching from earth to heaven, "And behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it," Gen. xxviii. 12. Compare John i. 51, "And he (Christ) saith unto him (Nathanael) verily, verily I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." The ladder, seen by Jacob, is evidently a type of Christ. It is set up on the earth and reaches to heaven, *i. e.* it connects our earthy abode with the heavenly; above it God stands in the attitude of attention looking down upon his humble pilgrims in this vale of tears. So Christ is the real mystic ladder which unites the heavenly abode with the earthly, the divine nature with the human; through him God regards the human race in tender mercy, and on him the angels of God ascend and descend, on their errands of love. In and through him all that was beheld by Jacob in prophetic vision and all that was promised to Nathanael, the Israelite, indeed, is fulfilled.

It has been supposed by some that the declaration made by our Saviour to Nathanael will not be verified until the day of the final judgment, when the Son of Man will come in the clouds in company with the angels to judge the world in righteousness. That awful solemnity may indeed be regarded as a fulfilment of this prediction in one of its aspects. But the design of our Saviour was not, in this instance, to impress this humble Israelite with a sense of the reality of last times, so much as to encourage and comfort him with the assurance of angelic communion with the true Israelites of the Gospel dispensation. Here there is not only a communion of saints, but also a communion of the saints with the angels in heaven, even in Christ in whom all things are reheaded both of things in heaven and things on the earth. All this teaches that the an-

gels are personal creatures. They have consciousness, will, and reason, and are capable of joy. "There is joy in Heaven," &c. This too is against the rationalistic view which teaches that the Old Testament doctrine of the angels was only developed after the exile, and that it was actually derived from the religion of the Persians; hence it is maintained that Christ accommodated himself to the Jews in this respect in his frequent allusions to the angels. This accommodation theory is so obviously without ground that the bare naming of it is a sufficient refutation. That the Jews, except the Sadducees, believed in the existence of personal angels, as an order of beings distinct from men, there is not the least doubt. Now their belief is either grounded in truth, or it is not. If not, then Christ and the Apostles deceived them; this, of course, they could not do if they were true teachers. Besides the angels actually appeared in the New Testament times to sundry persons whose testimony cannot be doubted, unless we doubt the entire Gospel. For instance, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to the virgin Mary, and came unto her and said: "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women." Luke i. 26, 27, 28.

The angel of the Lord appeared unto Joseph. Matt. i. 20; ii. 13. There appeared unto Zacharias an angel of the Lord, standing on the right side of the altar of incense. Luke i. 11. The angel of the Lord came upon the shepherds, and said unto them: "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord." Luke ii. 10, 11. The angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone from the door of the Saviour's sepulchre, and for fear of him the keepers did quake and became as dead men. And the angel said to the women, "Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified." Matt. xxviii. 2, 3, 4, 5.

Thus far but a single angel is named each time. Perhaps this is but the theophany of the Old Testament repeated. Be it so. The Son of God could not appear in the form of an

angel, if there were not an order or class of such beings. To Mary Magdalene, to Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, however, *angels* appeared and said that Jesus was risen from the grave. Luke xxiv. 4, 22. In a vision an angel appeared to Cornelius. Acts x. 3. So angels appeared at sundry times to the different apostles. Acts v. 19; xii. 7; xxvii. 23, &c. See especially Rev. v. 2, 11. "And I saw an angel proclaiming with a loud voice, &c. "And I beheld! and heard the voice of *many* angels round about the throne," &c.

Angels came and ministered unto Christ himself. Matt. iv. 11; Mark i. 13; Luke xxii. 43; John xii. 29.

Here as Dr. Ebrard says, to whom I am indebted mainly for aid in making these references, "the admission of the accommodation theory is impossible." To deny the doctrine of the angels we must, to be consistent, deny the entire Bible.

The specific difference between angels and men consists in this that the latter have material bodies and are generically connected with their race, which is not the case with the former. They are spirits, though not emanations from God who is a spirit, but *created* spirits. They are not omnipresent, they are confined to space; hence they must have bodies, and a habitation; their proper home is heaven; yet, as said, they have not material bodies. When they come to our earth they are transient visitors. Some have supposed that the angels are the disembodied spirits of men. This view, however, is contradicted by the remarkable passage recorded in Mark 12; 25, where the glorified saints are said to be like the angels: "For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven." Or as Luke has it, xx. 35, 36: "But they which shall be counted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Here the distinction is clearly and distinctly stated; be-

cause resemblance necessarily excludes the idea of sameness. Nor have we any account in the Bible of the resurrection of angels. It would sound strange, indeed, to hear it said, that in the last day the angels that are in their graves shall hear the voice of God and come forth. No; these are the sons of God who shouted together for joy when God laid the foundations of the earth, Job xxxviii. 4, consequently before man was created. Accordingly too we are taught in Ps. viii. 5, that God made man a little lower than the angels. Compare Heb. ii. 7.

II. This leads us to consider the relative position, and employment of the angels.

They hold, it seems, an intermediate place, in the scale of being, between Christ and men.

Men are made lower than the angels, as we have just seen. Jesus too was made a little lower than they, "for the suffering of death." Heb. ii. 9. Yet he is preferred above the angels both in person and office. "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." "For unto which of the angels said he at any time," "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" "And again when he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i. 4-6. Here we are taught that Christ is God, and that the angels are worshippers, consequently creatures. The only inference left us then is, that, if they are a higher order of rational beings than man, specifically distinct from him (for Christ did not take on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham), they occupy an intermediate position. They are not omnipotent, yet they excel in strength, and are called "mighty angels." 2 Thess. i. 7. Ps. ciii. 20. They seem especially to gather around the second Person of the adorable Trinity. They behold the face of the Eternal "Father which is in heaven," as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Matt. xviii. 10.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thou-

sands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory and blessing." Rev. v. 11, 12. They are interested in, and study into, the mystery of his person and work. "Which things the angels desire to look into." 1 Pet. i. 12. Hence in the vision of the ladder they are "*ascending* and descending." Heaven is their abode, but by men they are seen first where the mystery of the union of the divine nature with the human is revealed; hence first at the *foot* of the ladder. The true Israelites see the angels first *ascending* then descending on the Son of Man. In Bethlehem they are seen adoring the mystery of the incarnation; here they are heard singing: "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men." The thousand of thousands who ministered unto him and stood before him whilst seated on his glorious throne in heaven came down to our earth when he took upon him the form of a servant to worship his veiled divinity as essentially the same as that which fills all heaven with its glory. They accompany him on his journey through life; they minister to his wants, they support him when faint, and defend him when in danger, as it was promised. "He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Ps. xci. 11, 12. Hence he says, to one of his disciples who is ready to use the sword for his defence: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." They are with him in the garden of Gethsemane, and when suspended on the cross,

'Around the bloody tree they press,
The wondrous sight to see,
The Lord of life expire.
And when arrayed in light
He left his dark abode
They haste in rapturous flight
Up to the throne of God;
They waved around their golden wings,
And struck their harps of sweetest strings."

And as these holy intelligences gather around the person of our Saviour, they are also interested in the extension of his

kingdom. They are sent to minister to the heirs of salvation.

In regard to the form of their ministry we have no definite information. From Luke xiv. 6, we may infer that they fill their ministerial office as remembrancers. The two angels, one at either end of the grave, said to the fearful disciples: "*Remember* how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, the Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." From this it appears that while the Saviour was instructing his disciples in Galilee the angels were present, and treasured up his words in their memories that they might remind the forgetful disciples of what they had heard. But the ministry of Christ is continued in his Church. Through his ministerial servants, through his ambassadors, he is constantly teaching his disciples, and they in turn teach others. May not the *angels* then be present wherever God's word is proclaimed, so as to be able to remind Christians in the hour of their trial. This idea of angelic presence seems to be conveyed by the apostle Paul in his sublime language to the Ephesians, iii. 10, "To the intent that now unto the *principalities* and *powers* in heavenly places might be known by the *Church* the manifold wisdom of God."

As we shall see presently the bad angels tempt the people of God to do evil; why then should not the good angels be employed to suggest good thoughts to their minds and encourage them to do good?

The idea of *guardian* angels is taken from the fact that they guarded and defended our Saviour; hence too they are employed to defend the members of his mystical body. These are as dear to Christ as the apple of his own eye, and the motive that he presents for not harming even the least one of these, is because their angels continually behold the face of their Father in heaven. The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him and delivereth them." Ps. xxxviii. 7. When the pious die the angels are employed to convey them to heaven. "And it came to pass that the beggar died and

was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Luke xvi. 22.

God employs the angels in the administration of justice and judgment. "The angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it." 2 Sam. xxiv: 16. "The angel of the Lord smote in the camp of the Syrians a hundred four-score and five thousand." 2 Kings xix. 35. So they will be active in the final judgment. "The harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire," &c. Matt. xiii. 39-41-42.

III. *The History of the Angels.* Here the question is simply whether or not they *have* a history. This follows as a consequence from the preceding. If angels are personal beings, as we have learned, and if they stand in organic connection with the created universe, then their life is necessarily historical. The organic in itself considered does not yet give us the idea of history. The vegetable and animal kingdoms, which are constantly unfolding their living powers around us, cannot be said to have a history; but the organic in the form of the *personal* must needs be historical. Here there is not only a development, but conscious development, not only an objective revelation but a subjective apprehension; not merely a succession of events, as they flow from a common life, but also an intelligent narration of said events; hence "*historein*" to tell us, to make known, to relate. The history of our world is but its developed life told, or related. So the history of the angels is but *their* developed life told, or related. What can we know about it? We must be content with general facts. Particular data cannot give us much trouble; for the obvious reason that they are not given.

We cannot tell for instance *when* the angels were created; hence we cannot tell how old the angelic world is. The *fact*, however, that they were created is clearly revealed. It is not revealed in Scripture that they were all created simultaneously, nor can we there learn that some are older than others; but it

is evident that their relation to one another is not generic; they were not born from a common angelic parentage; but directly from their common heavenly parent. For this reason they are a common brotherhood; they are "sons of God," held together as one family by a common life and a common bond of love. Their union is organic, though not generic. It has been conceived that because they are not generically united they cannot be in organic union, that as an order of rational beings they stand by themselves, without any living connection with the creation as a whole, and that each angel also stands by himself.

This conception is erroneous and finds its corrective in the unity of the creation. Even the idea of a mechanical union would exclude such a notion. Much more is it excluded by the idea of organic union. The idea of simultaneous birth does not exclude the idea of organic union. Twin brothers are flesh of the same flesh and bone of the same bone no less than those who are born into the world at successive periods. So the simultaneous birth of all the angelic hosts is no evidence that they are not all animated by the same heavenly life. Hence they are a fraternity—they are as said, "the sons of God," evidently made in his image. And if sons of God their creation was (like that of man) an actualization of the eternal idea of sonship as it is in his Only-begotten Son. *He* is the "*Prototokos*" of the angelic world as well as the human. In this is involved the truth that the angels were created in the image of God, as said; in righteousness and true holiness. They were created perfectible, but not perfect. With them, as with all rational creatures, righteousness and holiness must become habitual. Their love and worship of God must be from choice, free, voluntary. Otherwise it could not be acceptable. In such service, however, is involved the idea of *probation, trial*. That the commencement of the angelic life, as well as the human, was a probationary period, does not admit of a doubt. The choice of God's service implies the possibility of its opposite. Voluntary obedience implies the possibility of disobedience, and the very thought of such opposite

choice, or disobedience, is a temptation. The suggestion of such thought may be either from within or from without, or both. Whether or not there was any outward motive presented to the angelic mind for sinning against God we are not informed, nor does it belong properly to our subject to notice the various speculations that have been indulged in, with reference to the origin of evil. Its possibility, as actualized in fact, is all that belongs legitimately to our subject. Beyond the fact we need not *go* either for the proof of the possibility. A possibility need not be actualized, and hence does not prove a fact; but a fact necessarily implies its possibility. From the fact that some angels sinned and became apostate it is lawful to infer that it was possible for all to sin. And from the fact that some did not sin it is lawful to infer that the "*posse non peccare*" (the possibility not to sin) was present for all; *i. e.* they are free agents, and in the commencement of their history, to say the least, must have been in a state of probation.

To suppose that their life developed normally for a time without trial, and that they were placed in a probationary state *subsequently*, is by no means as philosophical as the opinion that the beginning of their history, like that of our first parents, was their great trial.

Now when we are met by the question: why did some continue, and develop, in holiness, whilst others became disobedient and fell from their first estate? the only answer we can give is; because, in this way the two classes respectively saw fit to exercise that freedom of will, that power to choose the good or the evil, with which the Creator endowed them. But why one class should choose a normal life, and the other class its opposite whilst in the same holy state of being, under the influence of the same holy motives, we cannot tell. That sin should originate in heaven among the holy angels, in God's immediate presence, is a "*gordian knot*," which, to the best of our knowledge, has never been untied. All we know is that it was possible, that the possibility lay in the nature of the personal creature, and that it was actualized in a fearful apostasy.

As there are evidently lower and higher orders of angels, we may suppose that their general society is governed by different hierarchs, all under the supreme control of Christ, "who is head over all things." It is only on this supposition that we can at all account for the existence of the two classes of angels spoken of in Scripture, the good and the bad.

The hypothesis of Dr. Dick and others will hardly hold, viz.: that each angel stands by himself and is committed to his own care, and is to stand or fall according to his personal conduct. "The only effect," it is said, "which one could have upon another, was by example and counsel, and excitation to good or evil." . . . "The individuality of the moral agency of angels, if I may speak so, is manifest from the fact, that while some revolted, others maintained their allegiance. Hence arises a new subject of speculation. It does not appear that the apostasy of angels was successive, or that some apostatized at one time and others at another, but we have some reason to believe that the revolt was simultaneous. How then was the concurrence of a multitude obtained?" The same author supposes it was obtained by a few, who had sinned first, enticing others as Eve enticed Adam. This is not a likely tale, that such sinners should be permitted to remain long enough in heaven to entice so great a multitude to unite in a rebellion against the God of infinite love.

The other view is much more credible, viz., that the apostasy was simultaneous on the ground of an organic union as represented by a hierarch. So too in regard to the allegiance of the holy angels. Individualism, in the sense of the school referred to, had no place among them. There was, of course, a personal responsibility, but only as the personal holds in the organic union to which it belongs. As "no man liveth to himself," so no angel liveth to himself. Hence we read of "Michael and *his* angels," and the "Dragon and *his* angels." Rev. xii. 7. The expression the "Devil and his angels is quite common," implying headship, hierarchy.

We are here then confronted with two orders of angelic life, the one normal and the other abnormal.

The difference between them we say, implies a period of probation or trial at the very commencement of the angelic history. The temptation to which the "devil and his angels" yielded, whatever may have been its nature or its form, was no doubt, common to *all* the angels, and was resisted by those who maintained their integrity. In this resistance and in the free choice of God's service their holiness, in which they were created, became habitual; they became more and more confirmed in it, and less and less exposed to the danger of sinning. How long the process continued until they reached the ultimate *status confirmationis* from which it is morally impossible to fall we cannot ascertain. Some think it is still possible for the holy angels to sin and fall, and others entertain the opinion that they were fully confirmed in the good, so as to be beyond the reach of all danger, immediately after the first trial. The latter opinion, we think, is more plausible than the former. We cannot well conceive of a second revolt of angels in heaven, or of a second apostasy. Newly created angels might fall on their first trial, but after their life becomes habitually holy we conceive that their fall is as impossible as that of the glorified saints. The old world of holy angels stands secure, and will forever stand to the praise and glory of the great Creator. It will not even be affected by the "general wreck of matter and crush of worlds." It will stand after the natural "heavens shall have passed away with a great noise," and after "the elements shall have been melted with fervent heat." Between it and the old world of fallen angels there is an impassable gulf fixed. The holy angels cannot become unholy, and the unholy can never become holy.

Of the relation of the former to the human world we have already spoken; it remains yet to speak more particularly of the "devil and his angels" and their relation to the children of men.

Of the noble origin of his majesty nothing more need be said. He was created an angel of superior rank. Some think he was the highest of all the angels; hence the immense depth of his fall in consequence of his sin. There has been much

speculation in regard to the particular nature of that crime which expelled him from heaven. Some say it was jealousy or envy ; it is thought that he became jealous even of Christ. The most common tradition is that his sin was that of pride. Hence the expression, "Proud as Lucifer." Like the sin of our first parents it has been resolved into that of unbelief, as this is the root of all sin. We can help ourselves best to the true idea in the case by ascertaining the import of his most unholy name.

There are many names given him in Scripture, but their significations are all gathered up into one. He is called the Serpent, Gen. iii. 1, the Old Serpent, Rev. xii. 9. The Red Dragon, Rev. xii. 3. The Accuser of the brethren, Rev. xii. 10. The enemy, Matt. xii. 39; Satan, Job i.; Zach. iii. 1, 2; Belial, 2 Cor. vi. 15; Beelzebub, Matt. xii. 24; Mammon, The Angel of the Bottomless Pit, Rev. ix. 11. The prince of the power of the air, Eph. ii. 2. Lucifer, Isa. xiv. 12. Abaddon, or Apollyon, Rev. ix. 11. Legion, Mark v. 9. The god of this world, 2 Cor. iv. 4. The Foul spirit, Mark ix. 25. The Unclean spirit, Mark i. 27. The Lying spirit, 2 Chron. xxx. The Tempter, Matt. iv. 3. He is also called a liar and the father of lies. He is in fact called everything that is bad. But all that is bad in the names thus far mentioned, and we might add all the bad that is, or can be imagined, is included in the name *Devil*. This is his common and most appropriate New Testament name. Nor is it a slander to call him at any time by this name. What is its import? According to the etymology of the word, *διαβολος*, it means thrown across. The idea is that of a personal being who throws his will, with all its weight, across the will of God, or lifts it up in rebellion against God. This is sin, which is destruction. Whatever form it may take, whether of unbelief, pride, deceit, enmity, hate, or falsehood, it is the same in its nature; hence the meaning of the word Devil, in plain English, is "The Destroyer" (see Pool on the Acts). A devil is a destroyer. But now we are speaking of *the Devil*, and we must try and give him his due. Here as elsewhere divines have made bad work by reasoning in

the abstract. By some indeed the Devil is regarded as a mere creature of the imagination, a sort of figurative personification of evil; others view him as the greatest of sinners in the universe, but as standing by himself, having no concrete connection with other fallen angels, each one of whom is again viewed as a smaller devil standing by himself. They are confederated only by a sort of immoral bond for a wicked purpose. They are conceived of as an army of locusts, or grasshoppers, combining their forces for the destruction of every moral plant in the vast field of personal being. But here the question of Dr. Dick will again arise, "how could the consent of so great a multitude be obtained for such a diabolical purpose?" Or we may put in a question of our own: why is it, on this theory of accidental combination, or agregation rather, that they do not fall out among themselves? Why does not Milton in marshalling them on the ethereal planes to make battle against the angelic hosts of heaven, and the sacramental hosts of God's elect on earth, throw them into confusion and make them destroy themselves? Though his poetry is not theology, his theological instinct was too good nevertheless to commit so great a blunder as this. It is felt by him, as it is in the Christian consciousness generally, though not clearly perceived, that the devil and his angels are a power for evil in a vastly different sense. As said, there is a common angelic life. So we must conceive that there is a common life of fallen angels, or a common abnormal angelic life, individualized, of course; yet so that the individual holds in the general, whilst this again is in the form of the countless multitude of individuals, under the leadership of one grand chief. This is The Devil of the New Testament. He is a real objective personal entity; but not a single individual by himself; he is Legion. This is the name which he gave himself; he said: "My name is Legion, for we are many:" Mark v. 9. In this instance the infernal liar spoke the truth, and thus proved himself to be a better theologian than the modern divines who speak learnedly of evil in the abstract, only occasionally making a polite bow to his Satanic majesty to win a smile of approbation. He knows they

are on his side, though they know it not. *No, NO!* Evil is concrete, hence a fearful reality. The abnormal angelic life in legion form is not a mere voluntary combination; this it is; but it is vastly more. It is the *real* personification of all that is evil. This, we repeat, is the real objective Devil of the New Testament. Hence, as a certain author says, who withholds his name, "Nay, all the mischiefs he is empowered to do, are in the Scripture placed to his account, under the particular title of the Devil, not of devils in the plural number, though they are sometimes mentioned too; but in the singular, it is the identical individual Devil, *in* and under whom all the little Devils, and all the great Devils if such there be, are supposed to act, nay they are supposed to be governed and directed by him. Thus we are told in Scripture of the works of the Devil, 1 John iii. 8; of casting out the Devil, Mark i. 34; of resisting the Devil, James iv. 7; of our Saviour being tempted of the Devil, Matt. iv. 1; of Simon Magus a child of the Devil. The Devil came down in great wrath, Rev. xii. 12, and the like."

Thus we are brought to the inquiry: what is the relation of the fallen angels, whose abnormal life is under the control and command of this *real* personal hierarch to the human family?

Before entering upon this mysterious part of our subject it is important to recollect what we have gained from the past. We have learned that the created universe is organic, that as the whole sustains a vital relation to the fountain of all life, so all the parts sustain a vital relation to each other. We have learned that the general relation of the creature to the Creator holds in His Son through the Holy Spirit. We have learned that the union and communion of the different parts of nature are not opposed to their specific difference, that on the contrary diversity grounds itself in unity. We have learned that the creation as a whole is complete in the personal creature, and that this again is complete in the ideal Person, the Son of God, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the *express* image of *His* Person. We have learned that the personal creature, man, and the personal creatures, the angels,

were made in the same Divine image, and that consequently in their normal state they are in the same communion, notwithstanding their specific difference. They are one family. We have learned finally that the fallen angels, in consequence of their normal life having become abnormal, are in unholy league with one another, that their entire life is *really* personified in their hierarch, the devil.

From all this taken together, and especially from the last, it follows as a natural consequence, that if human life becomes abnormal it is actually in communion with the devil and his angels. This we know it has become in fact, and there is no doctrine revealed more fully in God's Holy Word than this, viz.: human nature as affected by sin is under Satan's dominion. This doctrine too is just as philosophical as it is scriptural. If in the universe of God there is a union and communion of the good, good things, good men and good angels, why in the name of common sense and in the name of truth, should there not be a communion of the evil, since evil has originated? What is the bad, the evil, but the self-perverted good, the *διαβολος*, (the devil)? And in what communion can we find it if it be not in communion with itself? This is the destroying principle, and the devil in whom it is embodied, is emphatically the destroyer.

Sin was *his* fall and destruction; hence he is called a "murderer" from the beginning. He was the instigator of the sin committed by our first parents, which was their fall and the fall of their posterity. When they sinned they were led captive by the will of Satan. When they yielded to the temptation they yielded to Satan's power. In not doing God's will they did the will of the devil; they accepted him as their king.

When they left the communion of God and the holy angels in heaven, by their disobedience, they entered the communion of the fallen angels; and if man continues in that communion while he lives on earth, he must remain in it in the eternal world, "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Why so? Why should bad men be closed up with the bad angels in the world to come if there be no affinity between them, or want of affinity for the good, to say

the least. In the whole universe there are but two communions, the good and the bad, and they who are not in the good must needs be in the bad. For this obvious reason, throughout the entire Bible, unregenerated humanity and unregenerated or wicked men are spoken of as being in the kingdom of Satan and of darkness. We are bound to believe the Saviour and Apostles on this subject. Christ says emphatically, Jno. xiv. : 30: "Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the *prince* of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me." The Apostle Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 4, calls Satan the god of this world: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." Eph. ii. 2: "Wherein in times past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air; the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Eph. vi. 12: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. 1 Jno. iii. 8: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning."

Such declarations as these are too plain to be misunderstood. Neither Christ nor the Apostles have the least conception of sin or evil in the abstract, or as existing only in man apart from Satanic influence. They declare facts as they hold in the concrete. "The god of this world!" "The prince of this world!" What is the meaning of such expressions? Does not the "World" here mean, in distinction from the kingdom of the Saviour's grace, the whole of humanity sold under sin. Who is its god? who is its prince? The answer has been given. Satan is the god of this world, except so far as regenerated by the Spirit of God. There is no sin in the world without Satan, neither hereditary sin nor actual sin. It was once said: "No Christ no Church," no Church no Christ; the union between them being mystical. May we not say here: "No devil no sin, no sin no devil. This may be said of sin as such, original as well as actual sin. Try as we may to force the distinction between the two into a separation, they are after all in

principle the same. Original sin is actual sin in germ, and the actual sin is the original sin developed. The god of this world is the god of abnormal humanity in every stage of its existence from the mystery of conception and birth to the more awful mystery of death. Satan works in the children of disobedience, as we have just been told by the Apostle. What consummate nonsense to admit the depravity of infants and to deny that they are under the power of the devil! All such abstract notions must lead to confusion, if not to downright infidelity.

No; as said before, there are but two communions: the one of the good and the other of the evil; the one of light and the other of darkness; the one of Christ and the other of Belial. 2 Cor. vi. 12: "So this truth has been held in the consciousness of the Christian Church in every period of her history. In her consciousness the conflict is all the time between the seed of the woman (Christ) and the serpent. When the power of the serpent shall be destroyed, then humanity will be redeemed. So it holds in the consciousness of our branch of the Church. "Our comfort in life and death is that Christ has fully satisfied for all our sins and delivered us from all the power of the devil." By bringing home to himself the meaning of this expression, the veriest boy can satisfy himself of its orthodoxy. True the full satisfaction for sin by the blood of Christ is one thing, and deliverance from all the power of the devil is another; but are they held apart in the Christian consciousness? Or do they hold in their concrete union? Does not every Christian feel and know that his salvation from sin is his deliverance from the power of the devil? And does he not feel too that his deliverance from the power of the devil is his salvation from sin? In other words, does not the Christian feel and know that sin is the power of the devil? Is not sin whether original or actual, the devil's work? Will any Christian deny that it is his spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience? Here the Christian consciousness is orthodox, whilst certain modern divines are afraid to be either orthodox or Pelagian. Afraid of the truth lest too much might be made of our Lord's holy sacraments and Church, and ashamed of Pelagian error lest the devil himself might be slandered.

This then being settled that there is a communion of evil on the ground of an abnormally organic union of the devil and his angels with depraved and fallen humanity, it is easily seen why it is that *all* sin, whatever may be the forms of its manifestation, is put down to the account of the devil as its author. The history of our world's sin is but the history of the devil's work. Not that this makes the guilt of man less by any means; as we shall see in the sequel, it rather makes it the greater.

For man voluntarily to enter the communion of the devil, to do his will, to imitate his example and actually to become assimilated to his character, whilst it is his blessed privilege to enter the other communion with God, the holy angels, the saints and actually to become like God, is certainly to involve himself in the deepest crime, so that we can truly say to him: "Thou art inexcusable, O man, that doest such things." He is guilty just because he becomes diabolos with the chief of devils, throwing his will with that of all the diaboloi across the will of God.

Every sin committed by man is but a repetition of Satan's sin. All abnormal or sinful human life is but the outspreading of the devil's abnormal life. Hence sinful men are called in God's Word, emphatically the children of the devil. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Jno. viii. 44. This declares a unity of evil life, of purpose and will. Why God permits evil to exist in our world we are not told. Why this common enemy of man should be permitted to go about on the face of the earth like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, remains one of the sealed mysteries. It has been supposed that sin has been permitted to abound in our world that grace might much more abound. This suggestion was made to the mind of an inspired Apostle; but he shudders at the thought. We must be content with the fact that evil exists, that Satan has his empire, that the depth of human sin is Satan's depth.

It is a comfort to know that his power is not unlimited. He is a creature though evidently stronger than man, having many principalities and powers at his command. Furthermore he is said to be reserved in chains until the final judgment. Yet it

seems he has liberty to roam abroad on the earth and to effect his diabolical purposes.

It seems in the time of Christ certain persons were really possessed of the devil. This is remarkable. There seems to be a certain coincidence between the Satanic development up to this point of the world's history, and the Jewish History by which humanity is prepared in a positive way for the Incarnation. As the way was preparing for four thousand years for the advent of our Lord, it appears that Satan was working himself more and more deeply into human nature; so that when Christ becomes incarnate the devil is also in his hellish way incarnate. It was not enough that he should be the tyrant, the god of this world, and that as Belial he should have his idolatrous worship of all the heathen; when Christ comes in the regular line of promise, he as the arch-enemy of man, must also be in Judea, on holy ground, to destroy, if possible, the infant Saviour; and when he cannot succeed, he would also be incarnate. He would take real possession of man and beast. He entered certain persons and also the swine.

Hence there are instances recorded of certain persons really being devils, and of some being possessed of the devil. "Chosen twelve and one of you is a devil." John vi. 70. But in this sense all who are like minded with Judas are devils. All the children of the wicked one are diaboloi. As the world stood in the Saviour's day and as it now stands there is nothing extraordinary in this. But the cases of real possession recorded in the New Testament are special cases. Math. xvii. 18: "And Jesus rebuked the devil, and he departed out of him."

Mark v. 15: "Him that was possessed with the devil." vii. 29: "The devil is gone out of thy daughter." The instances are numerous.

The only question with which we have to do is: were the possessions *real*? The Christian faith demands an affirmative answer. To say that diseases are here called devils is to do violence to the obvious meaning of the Saviour. He healed many diseases, but they are always called by their appropriate names. Christ healed diseases *and* cast out devils.

All nations have had some idea of demoniacal possessions, and we have no right to say that there may not be such in every age of the world and even in our day. The instances recorded in the New Testament of demoniacal possessions and of Christ casting out the devil, shows that Christ is the rightful sovereign of humanity and that Satan is a usurper. It shows too that the design of Christ was to redeem humanity from the power of sin and Satan and finally exterminate him from the earth.

The whole subject of the habitation of the fallen angels, especially their final habitation is difficult. The Scriptures tell us it will be hell. But where hell is we cannot tell. The earth and the heavens will be taken up in the new creation. This will be all radiant with celestial light and glory, from which the wicked angels and finally wicked men must be excluded. They must be cast out into outer darkness. It is set forth in Scripture in the use of the most awful figures: "The bottomless pit," "Lake of fire," "The everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

The word "*prepared*" signifies an abode. As the earth was prepared as a suitable abode for man, so hell, the everlasting fire, was prepared for the devil and his angels.

ART. II.—THE RELATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO
THE NEW.

BY REV. J. M. TITZEL, A. M., EMMITSBURG, MD.

Immediately after man's woful fall from a state of innocence and happiness into one of guilt and misery, God set before him the glorious hope of redemption, in the gracious promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. This promise, however, was not at once fulfilled. Between its first annunciation and the actual coming of the promised seed, long ages intervened; and, since then, ages again have passed away, and yet is not the power of the serpent wholly destroyed. But, during the whole of man's history, God has been with him, working out his deliverance. From the time of the fall, until the actual appearance of the seed of the woman, He carried forward this great work of love among men, under the Old Testament dispensation; and, since then, He has continued to do so under the New. Yet, in these two dispensations, He has not come to men and revealed Himself to them in precisely the same way. Although both are parts of one grand scheme of redemption, and, consequently, in some respects alike, yet in other respects they differ very widely; and it is of the utmost importance, therefore, to the correct understanding of either of them, that there should be a proper conception of the relation in which they stand the one to the other.

That the two Revelations under consideration are, in some respects, similar, is apparent from the fact that in both, the parties concerned are the same. It is God who reveals Himself, and man to whom He reveals Himself, in the Old Testament as well as in the New. They are both alike in this, therefore, that they are both really a revelation of God to man.

Of the profound truths which are made known in the Old Testament, man could never have attained any knowledge by the mere development of his reason. The unfolding of no innate powers which he possesses, would ever have enabled him to discover the history of creation, or the true character of God and of His laws. The Jewish worship and polity were not such as man himself, in his fallen state, could have originated. Of all this, the history of the heathen world affords us ample proof. The origin of the universe engaged the speculations of the ancient philosophers for ages; yet, at the end of their labors, they were no nearer the solution of the problem of creation than when they began. Then, between their views of God and their forms of worship and those of God's covenant people, under the Old Testament dispensation, there was all the difference between heaven and earth. While the religion of the latter manifested the most wondrous adaptedness to the true wants of man's spiritual being, that of the former, throughout, was unsatisfying and even degrading. Compared with Jehovah and His worship, the gods of Olympus were, indeed, most miserable caricatures of Deity, and their sacred rites but poorly calculated to promote the true happiness and glory of their votaries.

But not only would it have been impossible for man, of himself, to have attained to a knowledge of the truths made known in the Old Testament, but, also, to have reached the perfection of being to which the Old Testament saints attained. The life of Abraham, of Moses, of David, of Elijah, and of other worthies of Israel, was not the mere result of the innate powers and tendencies of their hearts and minds. Of themselves, they could never have become what they were, or adorned their lives with so many and so great virtues. Their faith in God, and their devotion to the cause of truth and righteousness, were the result of a divine influence operating upon them through the Old Testament Revelation. This is, unquestionably, evident from the fact, that only such persons as enjoyed the benefits of this Revelation, manifested, in the same way, the virtues to which allusion has been made. In none of the contemporary heathen sages and philosophers, do we find similar faith and devotion.

What has just been remarked of the Old Testament Revelation, it is scarcely necessary to say, is equally true as regards the New Testament. It also makes known truths which it would have been impossible for man, of himself, to have discovered; and carries with it, for all those who receive it, the power of a supernatural, divine life. This, the Revelation itself, as well as history, both sacred and profane, abundantly proves. No one, indeed, who carefully reads the New Testament, can fail, unless he be incapable of receiving the truth, to perceive in it manifold evidences of its divine origin and character. Then, the history of the Christian Church clearly shows, as every one who candidly and honestly studies it must feel, that Christianity is the product not of mere nature, but of a divine power at work in humanity.

But not only in the respect now considered, are the Revelation of the Old Testament and that of the New similar; but, also, as regards the general object for which they have been given. Both look to the deliverance of man from the power of sin and death, and the bringing of him to the full consummation of his being. Though man, as he came from the hands of his Creator, was good, yet was he not at once made actually all that he was designed to become. Before he could reach the complete perfection of his being, it was necessary that he should pass through a process of development. This, through divine assistance, he would have done in a perfectly normal way, and without any violent crisis in his history, if he had remained true to his Maker and to himself. But, through his disobedience in the garden of Eden, he deprived himself of the divine favor and assistance which he enjoyed, and rendered himself incapable of normal development toward the true end of his life. In order that he might reach this, it was necessary, therefore, that he should be delivered from the power of sin and death, to which he had subjected himself, and that the divine favor and assistance which he had lost in the fall, should be restored to him again. Now, the object of the Old Testament, as well as of the New, is to furnish just this needed aid and deliverance. And that this really is the object of both Revelations, is clearly

taught in the Scriptures themselves. Thus, in the Psalms, we read: "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to Thy words. * * * Thou, through Thy commandments, hast made me wiser than mine enemies; for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers; for Thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep Thy precepts. * * * Through Thy precepts I get understanding; therefore, I hate every false way." (Ps. cxix.) And St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy, writes: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.) That the object of both Revelations is what has been stated, is also evident from the effects produced by their operations on the minds and hearts of men. Their invariable tendency is to lead those who come truly under their influence, to avoid sin, and to walk in the ways of truth and righteousness. The purest, noblest, and holiest men of all ages, have ever been found among the number of those over whom the Revelations of the Old and New Testaments have exerted a profound and controlling power.

But while the Old and New Testaments are one, as regards their source and ultimate object, yet, as has been already stated, in other respects they are quite unlike each other. The form of Revelation is not the same in both. God manifested Himself to His chosen people, under the Old Testament dispensation, differently from what He does under the New. He is present in the latter as He was not in the former. The outward, visible manifestation in the pillar of cloud and of fire, which went before Israel during their wanderings through the wilderness, and, as the shekinah, rested on the wings of the cherubim over the mercy-seat in the tabernacle and in the temple, has been superseded by the inward, invisible presence in the power of a new, divine life, while the bloody rites and sacrifices of the earlier dispensation have given place to the blood-

less ordinances of the later, and the restricted favors of the Old have made room for the all-embracing mercy of the New.

Throughout the Scripture record of the two Revelations, indeed, a manifest difference between them is recognized and taught. The one is continually represented as *outward*, *shadowy* and *preparatory*, while the other is declared to be *inward*, *substantial* and *fulfilling*. Thus, in Jeremiah, we read: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be My people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." (Jer. xxxi. 31-34.) In the Epistle to the Colossians, we are plainly told of the ordinances of the earlier Revelation, that "they are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. ii. 17); and in the Epistle to the Galatians, it is just as plainly declared, that "the law was our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal. iii. 24); while the chief object of the Gospel, according to St. Matthew, is to prove that Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it.

Here, however, the question arises, In what sense is the Old Testament *outward*, *shadowy*, and *preparatory*, and the New *inward*, *substantial*, and *fulfilling*? And this is an all-important question, inasmuch as these terms may be, and indeed are, variously understood. Unless, therefore, we determine definitely and correctly their meaning, as applied to the Rev-

elations under consideration, we shall only delude ourselves in supposing that they convey to us any real knowledge.

In the current theology of the day, these distinctions are generally recognized and taught. The only sense, however, in which many understand the Old Testament to be *outward*, and the New *inward*, is this, that in the former, many outward rites and ceremonies were required to be observed, while in the latter, the main stress is laid on subjective acts of faith and feeling. *Shadowy* and *substantial* are understood by the same persons to signify merely that the ordinances of the Old Testament were purely of a typical character, signifying what was to take place, whereas, those of the New continually refer us to what has been already accomplished, and is of full force without them. The Old Testament, at the same time, is supposed to have prepared the way for the New very much in the same manner as a teacher, by his earlier instructions, prepares the way for his students to apprehend and understand his subsequent teachings. It is preparatory, in other words, as presenting the simpler truths concerning God and man, without a knowledge of which it would have been utterly impossible for men ever to have grasped the truths finally made known by Christ.

At first thought, all this seems to be very plausible and satisfactory. Yet it requires but very little consideration of the subject to be convinced that in reality it is the very reverse. That the Old Testament dispensation abounded in outward rites and ceremonies, is unquestionable; but it is equally unquestionable, that these rites and ceremonies were not appointed to be performed without a corresponding state of heart and mind. The true Israelite was not a person who, in a merely outward way, attended to the ordinances of his religion, but one who did so in a proper spirit. In the Old Testament, the outward act was never designed to be separated from the inward motion of the heart, but both were to go together. So, also, in the New Testament, the outward and the inward are always united. The truly Christian man abounds not only in subjective experiences of holy feelings but, also, in corres-

ponding holy acts. The faith that saves, is the faith that works by love. The worship which is well-pleasing to God, consists not merely in reverential emotions, but in the outward expression of such emotions. "Pure religion and undefiled, before God and the Father, is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (James i. 27.) Thus, we find that so far as the union of spirit and form in acts of worship is concerned, there is no difference between the Old Testament and the New. In both, the two are required to go together, and neither is of any real value or force separated from the other. As the letter, without the spirit, is dead, so, also, may the spirit, without the letter, be said, in some sense, to be dead, or at least powerless, in either dispensation. But what now comes of the common way of understanding the terms *outward* and *inward*, as characterizing the two Revelations whose relation we are considering? Either both words mean the same, or else they mean merely that, in the former Revelation, more sacred rites were commanded to be observed than there are in the latter. Thus, these words would indicate only a difference in degree, between the two Revelations. So, also, the other words mentioned as designating, respectively, the character of the Old and the New Testament.

But, surely, the words, *outward* and *inward*, *shadow* and *substance*, *preparation* and *fulfilment*, cannot properly be used to signify a mere difference in degree. They, unquestionably, imply, if they mean any thing at all, a difference in kind. And such, really, the Scriptures, throughout, teach the difference between the Old Testament and the New to be. Thus, in the former, we are continually reminded that it is not complete in itself, but that it is to be superseded by something higher, to which all its rites and ordinances look; while in the latter, we are just as continually reminded that it is the final revelation, and that, through it, is supplied all that man needs, in order to the perfection of his being. Moreover, the New Testament clearly teaches that complete redemption from the power of sin and death is possible only through a life-union

with the risen and ascended Saviour, who "learned obedience by the things which He suffered; and, being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation" (Heb. v. 8, 9); and that this union is effected through the Holy Ghost, who came only after Christ's glorification, and who, consequently, was not present, under the Old Testament dispensation, as "the Lord, the Giver of life" in the highest and fullest sense. Jesus, Himself, emphatically declared, "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he." (Math. xi. 11.) And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as positively asserts, with regard to the worthies of the faith of the Old Testament, that "these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better things for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect." (Heb. xi. 39, 40.) If these words mean any thing at all, they must mean that the difference between the two Revelations we are considering is very wide and marked, and that, though the Old Testament saints "had the subjective longing for the promised salvation, and subjective faith in it, yet they had not the real objective regeneration, the germ of a new life, proceeding from the exalted Christ, which is implanted in us by baptism, and is nourished in the holy sacrament of the Supper." (Ebrard on Heb., xi. 39, 40.)

But while we must carefully avoid the common error of ignoring the real difference between the Old Testament and the New, we must also be careful not to make the difference between the two so broad as to exclude Christ and the Holy Ghost from having any real connection with the former. For, though neither was active under the Old Testament dispensation as He is under the New, yet both were present; and this in a most profound sense. It was Christ who, as the Angel of the Lord, appeared unto Moses in the burning bush—who went before Israel in the pillar of cloud and of fire during their wanderings in the wilderness; was their Champion, Guide and Ruler, and dwelt with them as their peculiar treasure and por-

tion; and it was the Holy Ghost who moved the prophets to speak, and strove continually with the rebellious hearts of the chosen people.

The question, however, here meets us: What was the nature of this presence of Christ and of the Holy Ghost? or, we may say simply, of Christ? for, if the nature of His presence be understood, we shall not have so much difficulty in determining that of the Holy Ghost, since it pertains to Him to take of the things of Christ and show them to us. It is scarcely necessary to say this question is, in the discussion in which we are engaged, the question on which the whole subject hinges. We shall now endeavor to present some thoughts in the way of answer to it.

And, in so doing, we would first of all direct attention to the following statements of Scripture: "God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him." (Gen i. 27.) "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." (Col. i. 15-17.) "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him." (Eph. i. 10.)

From these, and other statements of similar import, contained in the Scripture records, we infer that the image in which God created man, was the image of His Son, who was to become incarnate; and that, consequently, there must have been present to the mind of God, at the creation of man, the image of Christ, and that this image was the archetype according to which man was made. If this inference be correct, and we have every reason to believe it to be so, then the Incarnation did not originate with the conditions of redemption, but would have taken place even if man had not fallen. The Word was made flesh not merely because of sin, but because in this way alone the Ideal of humanity could be realized: sin neces-

sitated only suffering and death. The nature of man, consequently, is not something foreign to the nature of the Son of God, but, in its very creation, was designed for union and communion with it; in other words, man was made for union and communion with God in Christ. And at the very beginning of his existence, man began to actualize such relation, as is evident from what is told us in the Scriptures with regard to him and God in the Garden of Eden. Nor did the disobedience of our first parents, as subsequent history proves, wholly destroy this relation, and make its complete actualization impossible. The correspondence between God and man was, by the Fall, only put on a different footing from what it had been in the beginning; and it was made necessary, that man's nature should be redeemed, before he could be perfected and made meet for an inheritance in heaven, through union with Him who is the head of all principality and power. When, therefore, in the fullness of time Christ came, He came to "His own," and though "His own received Him not, yet as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 11-13).

If what has now been stated, however, be true, then it follows that Christ's presence, under the Old Testament dispensation, was not merely an official and representative presence, as is frequently maintained, but a real life presence. He was with Israel, not simply as a Guide and Teacher, but as one who sustained a most intimate relation to their inmost life, and in whom their life alone found its proper significance. And this, also, we think, the whole history of redemption teaches. When the Word became flesh, He did not take upon Himself a nature merely like to that of man in every respect, but He was born of a woman. According to the flesh, He was the son of David, the offspring of Jesse, the seed of Abraham, and could trace His lineage back to Adam, and, through him, to God. From Eve, "the mother of all living," down through the ages to the Virgin Mary, "blessed among women," His body was being

prepared for Him. Its preparation began in the womb of the whole race; but, as the race more and more wandered away from God, it was confined within the narrower limits of Judaism, and finally reached its consummation in the person of the "highly-favored" Virgin, the culminating blossom of the garden of the whole Old Testament dispensation. All this is clearly proved by the genealogical tables given us in the Scriptures. Nor can we suppose that the Son of God was not, in any real way, united to His body while it was thus being made ready for Him. We are, as it were, instinctively led to the opposite conclusion. It is, indeed, only on the ground of such union, and of Christ's consequent, continuous coming through the whole period of the Old Testament, that we can account for the care with which the genealogy of our Lord has been preserved and traced.

But, though there was a continuous coming of Christ in Judaism, yet was there no full actual coming until Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea. Then only was a complete union between God and man effected, and a proper occasion given for the multitude of the heavenly host to sing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." The actual coming, however, it may be well here to state, does not stand related to the continuous, which preceded it, as the ripened fruit does to the growing, but, rather, as the higher kingdoms of nature stand related to the lower. Somewhat as the vegetable kingdom, for instance, prepared the way for the animal, so did Christ's continuous coming, in the earlier dispensation, prepare the way for his actual coming in the fullness of time. Or, to make use of an illustration suggested by the writings of St. Paul, humanity may be said to have been betrothed to Christ in the Old Testament, but to be actually married to Him in the New Testament. Though both are parts of one grand, organic scheme of redemption, yet is not Christianity a mere development of Judaism, but, in the true sense of the term, a new creation. And hence, as has been already stated, the saints of the Old Testament stood in a very different relation to God from that in which we, of the New Testament,

stand. They were united to Christ, but not united, as we are, to Him as the actual God-man; for He had not then yet been born of the Virgin. The Holy Ghost was with them, and wrought in them, but not, as in our case, as the Comforter, for as such He had not yet come; nor as the Spirit of the glorified Christ, for Christ was not then yet glorified. The actual forgiveness of sins, and the actual power of a divinely-perfected life, these belonged not to them as they do to us. But when we say this, we would not be understood to affirm that the condition of the departed worthies of the earlier dispensation continues to be an inferior one. On the contrary, we believe that the work of Christ, in its consequences, reached into the world of departed spirits, and changed the condition of those there, so that the worthies of the Old Testament who died in the faith, enjoy now the same blessings as those of the New Testament who sleep in Jesus. And we believe thus, we would here add, not without reason, inasmuch as the Scriptures do not represent mankind as a number of independent individuals, but as an organic whole, in which the dead and the living form but one body, so that the condition of the one may be affected by the other. And that this is the case, is clearly taught in that passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews to which we have referred already, and in which it is asserted that the faithful of the Old Testament "without us should not be made perfect" (Heb. xi. 40); as well as in that remarkable passage in the Book of Revelation, in which the fulfilling of the desire of the martyr spirits under the altar before the throne of God (Rev. vi. 9—11) is made to depend on the fulfilling of God's purpose in regard to the living.

Having now briefly considered the way in which the Old and New Testaments stand related to Christ, we are prepared, in some measure, to understand and define in what sense the former is, *outward, shadowy and preparatory*; and the latter, *inward, substantial, and fulfilling*. And from what has been said we learn that the Old Testament was not *outward*, because Christ was not present in it in any real way, or because its ordinances were mere empty or dead forms, but because under it the requirements of the law of God were not truly satisfied,

and the Ideal of humanity was not, and could not be, realized. As the Court of the Temple was *outward* relative to the sanctuary, so was the Old Testament relative to the New. In it God, indeed, held communication with men, but He did not manifest Himself unto them in all His fullness and glory. On the other hand, the New Testament is not *inward* because it has no outward forms—for it has these, as well as the Old Testament had,—or because it has to do merely with subjective experiences; but because it brings men into the most intimate,—actual union with God, through His only begotten and well-beloved Son, “in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins” (Eph. i. 7), and by whom the Ideal of humanity has been realized and made actual. It is *inward*, because in it we have fellowship with the Father and the Son (1 John i. 3), and may “be partakers of the divine nature” (2 Pet. i. 4).

In the same way the Old Testament was not *shadowy*, because its rites and ceremonies carried no power in them, but because they continually pointed to something higher than that which they themselves conveyed to those who engaged in them. It was an adumbration of what has come after it, and has taken its place, as the blossom is an adumbration of the succeeding fruit. And the New Testament is *substantial*, in that it brings to us the Fountain of all life and blessedness, so that in it we have to do, not merely with the types of heavenly things, but with the heavenly realities themselves. Under its gracious dispensation we are truly “come unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel” (Heb. xii. 22-24).

As regards the preparation in the Old Testament for the New, this was not merely in the way of instruction, but rather in the way of culture. As the husbandman transplants the wild fruit tree from the open field in which he finds it, into his

garden, and prunes and tends it, that he may in due time graft it, so did God under the Old Testament deal with men. The manner in which this culture was thus carried on was two-fold. First, by the law, as an outward commandment demanding absolute conformity to its requirements, the Old Testament led man to feel his weakness and misery, and his need of divine assistance. Thus, by inducing him to look away from self to God, it in a measure crushed and destroyed his selfishness, and at the same time, made known to him the vanity of all things pertaining merely to this world. Secondly, by prophecy it awakened and kept alive in him hope and confidence in God, and in this way positively prepared him to enter into union with the divine nature. The New Testament, on the other hand, fulfils and completes the Old, by making that which was outward in it a part of man's inward being. In the later covenant, God, who in the earlier revealed Himself to man, reveals Himself in man, and the outward command is done away by becoming part of man's inmost life. It is, therefore, not destroyed, but in the true sense fulfilled.

In both Revelations accordingly we see a wondrous adaptation of means to an end. It was not by a mere arbitrary arrangement on the part of God, that the preparatory revelation was *outward* and *shadowy*, while that which succeeds it is *inward* and *substantial*. It was necessary that God should first, by an outward revelation, woo man to Himself, before He would reveal Himself in man. To have at once revealed Himself inwardly would have been to destroy the freedom of man, and so man himself. As it was by an outward influence brought to bear on him by the Evil one, that he sundered himself from God, so was he by outward influences again to be won back to God; and as this sundering was effected by creating mistrust of God in his mind, and engendering selfishness, so must that which would lead him back, destroy selfishness and awaken trust; which is just what the Old Testament Revelation did. So too was it necessary that the New Testament Revelation should be an inward and substantial one in order that man might possess permanent and abiding power to continue in holiness, and thus secure for himself eternal life.

ART. IV.—THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.

BY PROF. E. E. HIGBEE, D.D.

In nature below man we do not reach the province of history proper. There is here, it is true, a process in which the idea of each thing is becoming realized, and where the various orders, reaching up towards man, are found to be mutually related and dependent, one advancing above the other towards consummation in something higher. In the vegetable order, for example, the plant when viewed simply as brought into existence by the creative act of God, cannot be regarded as the accomplished realization of its idea, as this is contained in the divine mind. On the contrary rather, the idea itself reaches out from its infinite rest into space and time, where its full realization involves a process. In the plant there is growth, a wide compass of possibilities to be actualized. The plant is itself in movement, maturing and reproducing itself. It rises above the crude material base where it stands, — the seemingly motionless soil,—and, in its movement and change, its growth and reproduction, its glorification of the lower by carrying it up into leaf and blossom, into fragrance and moving grace, — shows itself a new and higher creation, a divine idea not until now through it dawning into light. The process here, however, is not intelligible to itself. While it evinces at every point that its origin and continuance have their ground in a life of intelligence and will, yet the law in which this life shows its presence and activity comes, in the vegetable world, to no inward manifestation in consciousness. The plant moves in a fixed and ever-recurring cycle, full of purpose, no doubt, but to itself dark, with no self-determination or judgment, with no self-advance in the way of free activity, and therefore with no *history*.

It has been stated already that in the process of creation there is an advance, as from the crude material to vegetable growth, and from vegetable growth again to animal instinct; yet this advance is not of such character as to imply that any one order passes beyond its own type of being by developing into another. The comprehensive world-idea breaks itself by limitations into subordinate, gradational ideas, through which it utters itself. There is in the lower a semblance of the higher, a mute prophecy of its approach, but no power in itself to transcend its own limits in such direction. This semblance and prophecy only show that the divine Reason, in which the lower process rests, contains also the higher, and this higher as already present in the creative mind declares itself more or less distinctly through the lower as about to appear. The animal is by no means an advanced vegetable, but a new and higher creation, which the vegetable only foreshadows and opens the way for. In its life there is far less fixedness, and far more distinct anticipations of the human. Yet in animal instinct there is no freedom, no self-determining activity, no real advance from within — no *history*. The animal lives and perpetuates itself, moving in the same monotonous circle from one generation to another.

In man we reach an entirely new and higher order of life. We come into the moral sphere. The law, still having its ground as before in the Divine, no longer acts, however, as an outward and blind power, but comes to an inward manifestation. It is authenticated as law in the reason and will, and the process before man is one of free activity, one in which he is himself to be a conscious agent in his own movement and destiny, and at the same time judge of his own activities. There is no monotonous circle here, ever-recurring, the same from generation to generation, but development, one generation taking up the life of that going before, not to repeat it, but to carry it onward towards its completion. There is a vast and ever-progressive movement, in which the idea of the world's life is pressing forward in the form of reason and will toward its full realization, — a process more grand than

that of the circling seasons, more sublime than the sweep of myriad stars — *history*.

The moral element, which thus characterizes man and makes history possible, is just that which, at the same time, makes it necessary for him to settle in his own mind the meaning and aim of the world in whose life he is so central and controlling. Only in this way can he properly grasp the destiny of his own being, and in wisdom pursue the proper course to reach it. His nature, just because it is in the sphere of intelligence and will, demands that he form some conception of history, that he bring its various phenomena under some general law, that he realize in his own consciousness the aim of its process, and not drift on the current, either with sluggish indifference or with trembling forebodings of strange disaster and wreck. The plant may bud, and grow, and blossom, and pass away, all unconscious of its own cycle of life; but man cannot; and to that very extent to which he allows it, he has perverted and degraded the very characteristic of his being, sinking back into mere unconscious nature. A philosophy of history is therefore not a matter of mere speculation, but a most earnest moral necessity. We have no right as men, as moral beings, to shut our eyes and be led, like nature below us, we know not where or how, whether by human or divine authority. We have no right to set aside what is fundamental in our nature and order of life, and blindly throw ourselves into the arms of either Providence or Fate.

As important as, in this light, is the question, what is the idea of History? involving as it does the whole order of the world's life in every form of its manifestation yet no adequate answer, we maintain, can be given except from the Christian stand-point. From an interest of science simply, the mind may be stimulated to reduce all its material to unity, and thus strive to find, in the midst of the various movements of ages, a world-teleology which shall serve such end; but the effort, if involving no more than a generalization of the intellect, will prove a failure. The central mystery of the Incarnation, itself a fact all comprehensive and full of illumination, appre-

hended by the higher intuition of faith, and, as thus apprehended, a fountain of life and light to the world, cannot be set aside as an unwarrantable assumption until demonstrated by some logical process. Its demonstration is within itself. Flesh and blood do not reveal it, and without it they cannot come to know either their own meaning, or that of the world. By faith we know the worlds were made (Heb. xi. 3), and in a deeper sense also for what end they were made (Col. i. 16).

At first view it may seem contrary to all right method of thought not to analyze carefully and without any previous assumption the process of history itself, using the various facts which it supplies as material to ascertain by induction the law regulating it. History allows no *a priori* construction of itself, it is claimed. In any analysis of its facts, however, we must be dependent upon our own apprehension of them, and upon the regulative laws of our own reason. This apprehension is itself of necessity conditioned as a moral act. Our nature does not reflect facts as an unconscious mirror. The facts themselves also do not stand before our gaze as objects of nature, but come to us in forms of reason and will. If then we are in any way linked to the supernatural, and have any power of beholding it in its own light, why, under such intuition, may we not find that which shall so illumine our whole analysis, as to prove itself, the more earnestly we examine the facts, the very central sun of the whole system? The very effort of reason to find a unity, and the consequent analysis and generalization, alike presuppose the reality of the unity sought for, and failing, as we maintain, to reach it, only find rest in the revelation of such unity and centre to faith.

Still further, in contemplating the complicated facts of history to analyze them, it is vain to suppose that the analysis is to proceed in the way of a mere repetition of the facts impressed upon the mind as a mass of disconnected particulars, the mind remaining a mere table of wax to catch the impress of them merely. The effort to analyze rests upon the assumption that it is made with a higher interest than that of mere repetition. Thought, which characterizes man, must of necessity be an

element in such a work. But thought itself requires that the process of history be viewed as a rational one, and not the mere chance play of blind forces,—that it have aim and purpose in the belief of which alone a philosophy of it can be conceived in thought to be at all possible. The philosopher, as such merely, approaches history bringing with him what he assumes as proved in speculation, and then uses this as a theory, viewed however as an established truth in the sphere of thought, but an hypothesis yet in the sphere of history, which however is to show itself a reality in the result of his analysis. So Hegel brings to his contemplation of history what he assumes as already speculatively proved, viz.: that Reason (defined as its own infinite material and energy—the substance of the universe, thought conditioning itself with perfect freedom) rules the world, and the hypothesis, which the result of his analysis of the facts of history is to make real, is, that "*the history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom.*" Now the Christian, not in opposition to philosophy, however, but as conditioning all the while its analysis and generalization, brings to his contemplation of the world a conception of history which shuts out all speculative hypothesis as to its aim or end. By his faith in the Person of Christ, which, in the interest of philosophy, he neither has right, nor is called upon, to set aside, he has found what is absolute truth in the sphere both of thought and of being. Christ is to him the Alpha and Omega of the world's movement,—the illuminating centre in which all processes are to reveal their meaning. Thus standing in Christ, he surveys the world; and past and present and future are measured in the life and light of faith.

In the consciousness of Christian faith then, what must be regarded to be the ultimate design of the world, and wherein lies the possibility of its realization? In answering these questions, what we have called the Christian conception of history will manifest itself.

Christian faith excludes at once the thought that the creation is either self-produced or self-subsistent. It holds firm the conviction, that the universe of the finite has its origin from

God, that it is the result of his own free, determining, creative act. "*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,*" is the unalterable preface to its cosmogony. Here the eternity of the world is properly guarded against, and at the same time that pantheism which identifies the created and the creating, or sees in the creative process God finding a form, or God finding his self-consciousness in man. The doctrine, however, that the world comes from nothing is not properly an element of Christian faith. While the world has its origin from God by a free creative act, and not by any necessity growing out of his own otherwise incompleteness, Christianity equally emphasizes the truth that it has its origin also in God. The dictum "*ex nihilo nihil fit,*" has for faith as well as for reason a large measure of truth. That the idea of the world, as a freely determined thought of God, is existent in the divine Reason,—in the eternal Logos, is distinctively a Christian conception. The universe is never viewed by faith as a sheer projection from God, and so separate from him by creative act as to have its life and continuance thereafter in itself. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men," (St. John i. 4). "In him we live and move and have our being," (Acts xvii. 28). In Colossians also, Christ is called "the First-born of *every creature,*" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*) and "in him and by him and for him all things were created," (*ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τα πάντα . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται*) (Colossians i. 16—18). Thus all things are viewed as having their archetypal existence in the Logos, and by him they come out into created finiteness in space and time, and as such exist for him, and hold together only in his self-subsistent life, which is ever the underlying principle of their order and continuance, ("*καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν*," Colossians i).

In this Christian view of creation, quite unknown to every other order of religious thought, there is involved also, in a general form, a world-teleology. The world is destined for the Logos. In its normal order it moves towards him, as its real centre of rest, and is to find in him its full realization. In him we and all things find completeness. In him, not viewed

as an unconditionable eternal—a move less absolute, essentially apart from the world and even beyond conception,—but in him, as incarnate,—as a self-revelation of God in man, as Christ the second Adam, and life-giving head of the race. Before the Incarnation, the destiny of the creation is viewed as hidden, there being no full utterance of the divine purpose; but in the Incarnation we have such utterance challenging both faith and adoration—a full revelation of the dispensation or economy of all processes as they are to come to their completion by being gathered together in one in Christ. (Ephesians i. 9, 10). A view of this kind has ever shown itself common to the thought of the Christian Church. Justin Martyr regards the physical world as including in itself a reference to the Incarnation, and this because pervaded by the Logos. He sees in Heathenism a measure of relative truth, because the very nature of man has not only the idea of God, but is essentially related to the Logos, in whose self-manifestation in the flesh, the absolute for the rational and religious life of mankind has been reached. In Irenæus the same thought comes to a fuller utterance. He sees in Christ the great archetype in living relation to which man came into being, and in partaking of which, therefore, he can alone realize his own idea. Christ, to his faith, involves in 'his own person' the whole organism of humanity, and recapitulating, carries its whole process freely onward in history to its completion. He constitutes thus the very source and substance and unity of every movement in which the primal idea comes to its full realization. Tertullian carries the same thought to what may be regarded a dangerous extreme, in full accordance, however, with his impulsive nature. In his view, the Logos is eternally related to man and the creation, as the very sphere in which he gives completeness to that eternal thought of God, according to which, the world was made to reach its proper fullness in the God-man. The Logos, therefore, in his view not only creates, but immanently controls the whole process of the world's life towards his own incarnation, which completes the involved idea of both the creation and himself. Space forbids a more ex-

tended reference. Nor is this necessary, for the object is not to lay stress upon the form of expression so much as upon the ruling thought itself which is common to the Church. This thought is, that the world is ever mediated to the Divine by the Logos, and that its processes are so controlled by him, that the mystery of his Incarnation is that central light in which their own meaning and movement may be properly understood. It is in the light of this great mystery of a pre-existent Logos opening the way most freely for his Incarnation, which so filled the glowing thought of the Apostle Paul, and glittered before the eagle-eyed intuition of St. John, that the order of creation, as given by Moses, is found to be so significant, in its advance from stage to stage, as to stand out a mysterious, foreshadowing prophecy of the *Divine-human*, towards which it is made to look and direct itself. It can hardly be regarded out of place here to examine this more in detail, not only as a general preface to history, but also as rendering more intelligible the divine idea under which the world was created, and reaches out to its full realization, for this idea as absolute, utters itself in different degrees, or through relative ideas, towards such full manifestation.

The material world is a mystery whose meaning and end can never be understood only as we come to know its relations to the higher world of moral and spiritual being beyond it. We may study its structure, acquaint ourselves with the workings of its laws, and bring them into the sphere of our conscious understanding in such way as to construct physical sciences. But who can conceive that this is the end of the whole material world, which apart from this subjective form in the sphere of thought, has a real objective existence? Matter, (there seems to be no less ambiguous term), unconsciously, yet really, as an element of the world's life, reaches out in its whole process towards Christ, as the centre where its own end is at last realized, (Romans viii. 21, 22). First, in its various masses, it is in fixed connection with an invisible power and law which determine all the while its character and form. The grain of sand, for example, is not an inert mass merely, in

this or that form and position by accident. There is with it and in it an invisible power holding its 'parts together in their fixed and definite relations. This is true not only of the crystallized sand, but also of the whole material world. The outward and inward, the visible and invisible, the form and the informing plasticity in fixed union' in the material world constitute its reality. It is impossible to conceive of a drifting, formless, lawless material proceeding from the creative word of God.

There is in matter, however, a capacity for something higher, where losing this, its fixed character, it is made to enter into relations with a more advanced power, that of vegetable life. Here the union is no less intimate, but of a quite different character. In the former grade we have what may be called fixed formation. Here we have growth—a process of development, in which the general law of vegetable life as the idea, comes into concrete actuality by constructing out of the already constituted matter limitations for itself, species, and individual forms in which its own presence and power are made manifest. In this way matter is taken up from its original base, and is so organically related to the power of life as to answer upon every hand its higher end. So far as the plant is above the crude soil beneath it, so far also has matter in it been exalted. For this exaltation it had original capacity, but could not of itself reach out so far. It prophesies in that direction, but cannot fulfil. "The metal at its height of being seems a mute prophecy of the coming vegetable, into a mimic semblance of which it crystallizes." (Coleridge).

Matter has not yet, however, reached its end. Above the vegetable world rises the animal. As the central life-power in the plant evolves its definite form, by organically taking up matter and assimilating it, transforming it from its fixed elementary character into living tissues,—leaves, flower, and fruit inclosing its own germinant principle of reproduction; so now the higher reality of life and instinct, and instinctive intelligence in animal being, lays hold of these organized structures of the vegetable world, and by still more wonderful energy car-

ries matter into still higher organic relations. Tissues, leaves, flower, and fruit now become blood and nerves, and flesh and bone, moved hither and thither by an instinctive volition dwelling in and controlling the whole animated organism. Matter becomes animate body. Having been taken up into the vegetable organism, it there makes manifest higher capacities, yet develops no power of satisfying them. Here again it prophesies, but cannot fulfil. "The blossom and flower, the acme of vegetable life, divides into correspondent organs with reciprocal functions, and by instinctive motions and approximations, seems impatient of that fixture by which it is differenced in kind from the flower-shaped Psyche, that flutters with free wing above it." (Coleridge).

In the animal, however, matter has not come to its height of progressive exaltation. Above the animal rises man, the sun which floods with light all that has gone before. The world now wakens to a consciousness of itself, and becomes possibly free. In man, under higher forms, we have the whole lower world recapitulated, and in this he shows himself on one side linked organically to the system of nature itself: but the lower world, as recapitulated in him, only comes in such exaltation to be the base of an altogether new and more noble movement, in which the order of creation on its material side reaches still nearer its completion. It is well to remark here, notwithstanding the digression; how physical nature, by such organic relationship with man's moral being, comes to be quite an important conditioning factor of history. Heeren perhaps makes too much account of this. He says, in the preface of his *History of Greece*: "the Mediterranean Sea belongs to the south of Europe; and it was by means of that sea, that the nations of the west were formed. Let an extensive heath occupy its place, and we should be wandering Tartars and Mongolians, like the Nomades of middle Asia." Though this may be an exaggeration, yet no one can question the influence which scenery and climate and the whole order of physical nature, have upon human life. What we are made to feel and hear and see, from the heavens above, or from the earth beneath, is ever entering

into our mould. The body is not only affected, but through it the whole inward nature. Climate seems to determine sometimes the whole practical life of a people. The Esquimaux are forced as it were to their peculiar mode of existence; so also is it with other zones beside the frigid, though in a less marked degree. Language is most seriously affected in this way, and thus indirectly the whole literature and imagination of a people come under its influence. The rough hardy speech of the north tells plainly of chilling blasts, of drifting snows, and of frozen lakes; while the smooth and gentle tones of the warmer south, are redolent of the breath of Spring, and plainly mirror sunny slopes, and flowing streams with tangled vine, and clustering narcissus.

"We are what suns, and winds, and water makes us;
The mountains are our sponsors, and the rills
Fashion and win their nursing with their smiles.—LANDOR.

The scenes of nature are our companions, growing more intimate day by day; and those most familiar, wherever we may be, are ever entering the study of our imagination, and often giving direction even to our acts. The shepherd is "half a shepherd on the stormy sea, and hears in piping shrouds, the tones of water-falls, and inland sounds of caves and trees, and in the bosom of the deep, sees mountains, sees the forms of sheep that graz'd on verdant hills." (Wordsworth). We are of the earth. Though the ties between physical nature and body and soul and spirit are invisible, they are nevertheless real.

✓ But to return. We have in man the union of psychic body with spirit. Matter has thus been taken up from its most elementary forms, and through mysterious mediations has entered into organic union with conscious spirit, where although in continual change, coming and going, and still the same, it never loses its identity as the characterized form of an inward life-principle and law. What glorification matter has now reached! We speak not of symmetry of proportion, delicacy of sensation, and flexibility of movement, which are in themselves truly wonderful; but, inasmuch as sensation has been taken up in

perception and carried on into the process of conscious thought and determining will, and the whole mystery of a moral world. has been reached, a Tabor of transfiguration, we speak of a certain translucence through the flesh of this invisible, illuminating, inner world. Emotions play upon the countenance and thought lights up the whole expression. Surface is becoming spiritualized. The eye seems filled with the soul, and the whole body gives momentary glimpses of the mysterious spiritual intercourse within. This of itself seems enough to convince one, that the Gnostic annihilation of matter, in order to get the unbound spiritual, is not in harmony with the divine law of life.

By no means, however, has the order which we have thus far traced come to its close. Psychic body is not the end. The glorified, resurgent, spiritual body is the precious goal towards which the whole process has been looking. "There is a natural (*ψυχικόν*) body, and there is a spiritual (*πνευματικόν*) body. And so it is written: The first Adam was made a living soul (*ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*), the last Adam a quickening spirit (*πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*). Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural," (1 Corinthians xv. 45-47).

The material world, as it is organically related to the moral and spiritual, finds thus its proper consummation in the resurrection and glorification of Christ. Especially in view of the disorganization of sin, which manifests its presence throughout the whole realm of nature, the whole physical creation, in and through man, groans and travails in pain waiting for redemption and deliverance, (Romans viii. 20-24). Matter, having reached in man such intimate union with spirit, does not thereafter, like Aestes' arrow, consume itself in moving onward, nor does it become lost in the infinite spirit. Its possibility of immortality and deliverance from corruption is reached in Christ. He is the centre in which the aim and end of the physical come to their revelation. The new heavens and the new earth, evolved by His quickening Spirit from the old as disorganized by sin, find in Him, the glorified human, the source of their completeness and their eternal headship. Nature and spirit

are not in irreconcilable antithesis, nor in such relation that the one must in the end absorb the other. Von Baader has said, with equal truth and beauty, "Die * * * geistlose Auffassung der Natur musste die naturlose Auffassung des Geistes und die gottlose Auffassung beider zur Folge haben."

What we have now said of the physical, is also true of the moral world. Indeed, because it is true of the latter, is it true of the former. In the moral world, however, reaching the sphere of consciousness and self-determination, we reach also the possibility of transgression, the possibility of willing an end contrary to that which the idea of our being, as in the mind of God, involves. The presence of sin, as inwardly conditioning the whole development of human life, the Christian conception of history most unequivocally recognizes, for the Incarnation reveals itself to faith, in one and that a very important aspect, as *redemptive and atoning*. It is impossible, therefore, from the Christian stand-point, to view the process of history as an uninterrupted normal development, without obstructions and disorganizations. Not only is the *presence* of sin recognized by Christian faith, but the *nature* of it also is to be properly determined in its light; and it is just this which is of immense importance in determining our conception of history.

✓ Christian consciousness will not allow the thought, that, in the mind of God, the idea of the world involved the *necessity* of sin. God is not viewed as an indifferent absolute, with no moral determinateness, but as a personal being, incapable of such a self-contradiction as to give being by creative act to that which of necessity must be contrary to his own will. That will, as law and life, inwardly to regulate the created, and even to form the essential ground of its being and continuance, cannot, without giving up the Christian conception of God, be viewed as active in producing that which must refuse it, and refusing, seek and make another centre in itself, and at the same time be viewed as active in condemning the same for only realizing what had already been purposed and determined by that will. God cannot be thus against himself; and our

sense of guilt excludes all thought that we are in any sense creatively involved in sin. Our moral nature, in condemning its own act, would in this case condemn God also. Sin in no sense is thus essential to the being or development of the creature. If present, it must be foreign to the original nature of man, and to the whole idea of the world. It may be thought by some that the creation of a human will, in which there is the possibility of transgression, is at the same time a determination of the will towards such transgression. But the will, by the very terms of the statement, is created a self-determining power, and hence its determination by creative act would be a contradiction of its own idea. The whole Christian conception of guilt, of alienation from God and true self, of repentance, of penalty and judgment, compel us to find the starting point of sin in the self-determination of the finite will against God, and to maintain that God's creative act in the moral sphere involved a process in which, without His determining volition, sin could manifest its presence. It is true, the process itself is only possible by the preserving presence of the Divine. The will in man has not, any more than the physical, a self-subsistent life. But this preservation of the will when contrary to the Divine in no sense fixes its determination, but rather opens the way for a better issue. Man, not beginning in a necessary severance from God, but with the possibility of becoming by his own decision consciously and freely in harmony with him, with the possibility, in other words, of willing God's will, his failure to do so is his own act, and the false determination of his will ever grounds itself in its own false activity, while the power to act is ever from God. This is the testimony of our own consciousness in the sense of guilt. St. Augustine well says, "Nunc vero usque adeo peccatum voluntarium malum est, ut nullo modo sit peccatum, si non sit voluntarium; et hoc quidem ita manifestum est, ut nulla hinc doctorum paucitas, nulla indoctorum turba dissentiat. Quare aut negandum est peccatum committi, aut fatendum est, voluntate committi. Non autem recte negat peccasse animam, qui et penitendo eam corrigi fatetur, et veniam pœnitenti dari, et perseverantem in pec-

catis justa lege Dei damnari. Postremo, si non voluntate male facimus, nemo objurgandus est omnino, aut monendus de." (De vera relig. cap. 14). In one sense we may say that God does not allow sin, does not permit it, only as he refuses to annihilate the will or reduce it to irresponsible nature. He has created in infinite love that in whose height of being the possibility of transgression is involved, but this only as a perversion of that moral nature, the destruction of which would leave the creation a dark, silent blank, not knowing itself or God.

Still further, the Christian view regards sin as universal, reaching the whole of man's individual being, and covering also the whole organism of humanity. By Adam's transgression it first became central in human nature, not, however, as substance like poison, nor as a germ capable in and of itself of expansion and development. In him it was such moral conditioning of himself, though under Satanic seduction, against God, such self-perversion of his will, turning from God, its true centre and rest, to itself and to the world, as to bring his life at variance with its own divine law, subjecting himself thereby to spiritual death as both the penalty and consequence of his fall, and at the same time so disorganizing the normal disposition and relations of his nature as to cause physical death and also to open the way for evil to keep its lodgment in the midst of all the cosmical laws of the earth.

In this statement, which we regard but a paraphrase of the Scriptural record, the idea is by no means involved, that sin is a new germinal substance, developing from its own essence and reaching out by steady process to its culmination. It has no such integral power. It is at every point self-destructive, and for its very movement must be connected with substantial being, and thus only come to have what in this view may be called a law of development.* It is will, in its power of self-determina-

* "O that I could a sin once see!
We paint the devil foul, yet he,
Hath some good in him, all agree.
Sinne is flat opposite to th' Almighty, seeing
It wants the good of *virtue*, and of being." HERBERT.

tion, turning from God, the only absolute fountain of life, and seeking restlessly for independence; but in gaining this independence, were it conceived possible, it would that moment cease to be. Its development, therefore, is not substantially its own. On the contrary, it is all the while in process, only as it is a self-perversion and disorganization of that which, quite apart from it, has its original being and law. The possible eternity of it is found only in our own eternal and necessary dependence upon God, and not in its everlasting independence and self-development.

There is yet an important question to answer, viz., how does it diffuse itself? How does it continue in force onward in the development of the race from Adam? We have already opposed the thought, that in the generation of man it can be generated as a substance with him: but we should stand in direct opposition to the settled conviction of the Christian Church, if we maintained that its presence is conditioned after the fall of Adam, by the act or acts of each one's individual will in consciousness. Nothing can be more plainly taught in Scripture than the fact of an universal disorganization of mankind and the world. The necessity of a *new* birth in grace, so solemnly enforced by Christ, at once presupposes this. The Apostolic commission, sending the Sacrament-bearing Apostles to *all* nations only gives practical earnestness to the same sad truth, and the solemn admonition to look forward to a new heavens and earth, made possible only by the sacrifice and resurrection power of Christ, assumes its world-wide universality. This universality is regarded as absolute, not depending upon individual self-conscious actions, but continually conditioning them. Is not sin then an essential element of our nature, part of the substance of being generated with us, and thus abidingly present? To answer this we must briefly refer to what is involved in man's generation.

In the plant, a definite plastic power in the process of growth moves the whole organism towards fructification, and in every new germ it is still latently lodged as the presence of a life-power there to carry it onward through a kindred process to a kindred

result, in connection, of course, with the necessary surrounding conditions. In animal propagation also, the higher unity of plasticity and instinct is carried over as a reproducing life into the embryo centre of the new. The animal structure, as body, is not first formed, and then a pre-existent or co-existent instinctive life-power lodged within it; but the life-power with all its distinctive characteristics is organizing the structure itself at all points and at all times from embryonic germ to developed maturity. We may call this life-power here the organic law of animalization, whose reality as general authenticates itself continually in the individual. It is a reality and not a mere abstraction or formula of the logical understanding. It is not a generalization simply, made by us from an examination of certain uniform resemblances and points of agreement between individuals, which may fall under our observation. It is that rather in which these resemblances and points of agreement have their real ground, and hence uniformly appear. It makes possible, as a general law immanent in the individuals, the generalization itself. The same is true also as regards man in his higher sphere. In generation here, it is not the body simply as a formed mass, which is reproduced with a pre-existent soul ready at hand to enter it and dwell there with an inbreathed spirit to link them as thus united to the higher spiritual world. The whole trichotomy of man's being, as constituting the organic life-process of his nature, is carried over truly into the embryonic beginning of the new, so that in generation the Adamic is made to move on organically from age to age. This position sets itself in opposition to that *pre-existence-theory*, which is common to the Gentile philosophy as well as to the anthropology of the Alexandrian school in the early Church, in which it is held that the *sarkic* only of man's being is really generated, while the *psychic* and *pneumatic* have long continued before in the Angelic sphere. The position is equally opposed to the theory of *creationism* in the usual form in which this theory is presented. That the body is only organically related to Adam through generation, and that the soul is created anew at every successive birth directly by God,

and outside of the organic life-process of the race, involves a dualism which is not satisfactorily removed by the statement, that the creation of the soul is simultaneous with the procreation of the body. The creation of the one, although simultaneous with the procreation of the other, is by no means their union in one common life-centre. Temporal conjunction is something quite different from organic union. This union of body and soul together with the spirit, which is after all the deeper ground of life in the whole nature, this union in one germinant centre, one *punctum saliens*, is conception which opens the way for birth. What God gives and man does are organically united in the conception itself. Now the perverting, disorganizing presence of sin reaches this characterizing law, which higher than plasticity or instinct, carries over its presence and power into the embryonic life-point of the new. It is this law which holds the constituting elements of man's being organically together in their starting point and in their development. It is just here that evil, on one side,* so attaches itself to the law of our human life in its genesis and unfolding as to be really inwoven in our conception and birth. Here as inwardly present, and covering all the possibilities of the nature itself, it becomes organic, or rather it has place and activity in that law of life which is so. Primarily this became possible by the self-perversion of the spiritual nature of the first Adam, who as generic head of the race, and lord of the creation, by his fall opened an unimpeded way for the perversion to cover the organic law of generation, and also to affect all those conditioning cosmical operations in the midst of which this law comes to utter itself. The Scriptures imply a truth of this kind, especially in the negative statement, made by St.

* There is another side, in which the evil, as universal and hereditary, manifests itself, notwithstanding, as *guilt*. It seems difficult to conceive of guilt without regarding it personal, and in no sense organic, depending upon a real self-determination of the person and this "*independent of the life of the genus*." The fact of guilt as connected with original sin must in some form be maintained. In what way, however, guilt inheres in the fallen life, it may be difficult to determine, but this should not lead us to deny the fact itself. See Muller's Examination of the Objections made by Rothe and Dörner to his own attempted solution of the difficulty (Christian Doctrine of Sin, vol. 2.)

John, of the method of natural generation, "which were born not of *blood*, nor of the *will of the flesh*, nor of the *will of man*." (St. John i. 13).

✓ Now man, under this universal condition of sin, originated in himself, and through his fall covering the whole world, commences and continues that development which constitutes history. Originally created to find his completeness and that of the world over which he was head, in willing God's will, in opening his nature freely to the highest self-communication and indwelling of God, in having his capacity God-ward fully met and filled by the great mystery of the God-man, the ideal, absolute centre of the whole order of creation, man's development, according to its idea, should move toward God. Such is its normal direction. The actual development, however, by the perversion of the life underlying it, must manifest itself abnormal. Not that sin, as some new self-created substance of life, developing makes history, (this we have endeavored to guard against); but that the originally divine-created human life, not destroyed in its self-redemption from its true centre, constitutes in its development a process in which it shows itself in ceaseless struggle with itself, and with the world, and with God.

Without at present bringing into view the supernatural, we may say, that there are two great powers in human life in jarring discord, or rather, that there is one process disintegrated and made to be in antagonism with itself. This may be seen in the great fact, (never to be lost sight of in forming our conception of history), that in the very midst of its own perversion, man's original being, as poised toward God and not entirely destroyed, asserts its presence in a hopeless reaching out for deliverance. The capacity for, and the need of, redemption are both realities. In the physical of man's nature, on the one side we have the terrible disintegration ever uttering itself in the universal, solemn dirge, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." On the other side, we have the constant and instinctive resistance of all this, in the concentration of vital forces to throw off the disorganization, in the contest

of body against corpse, which fails, if unassisted by the supernatural, to gain the victory. Disease has not in and of itself a development; and in sickness we ever see a struggle of life to emancipate itself from the evil as foreign to the law of the physical being, and yet inwardly lodged there. The body itself, not made to be a corpse, travails and groans for deliverance from its bondage. Indeed the whole creation abhors its own dissolution. It has, as it were, a mysterious sense that this is not its true destiny, not so much a dream of Eden lost, as a dim, shadowy vision of the Resurrection. The divine idea of its being, seems to utter itself over against the invading disorganization. Could we predicate consciousness of the physical, as we can of that which brought it into being, its whole process would sum itself up in a despairing cry for deliverance, in one universal groan uttering its need, and repeating its vain effort to cast off the terrible burden. To this despairing cry, heard by Him who has ears to hear, there is and can be but one answer, which will at all solve the mystery, viz. "*I am the resurrection and the life.*" The resurgent, glorified body of Jesus is the guaranty and source of the deliverance and proper perfection of the physical world-process. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, *according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.*" (Phil. iii. 21).

In the moral sphere, we see a kindred process of antagonism. God is resisted; self is made the centre; enmity is developed between man and man, and between nation and nation; debasing passions reign; world-wide wickedness covers every sphere of life, and reaches ever downward toward a dissolution more awful than the crumble of the grave. Yet even here, beneath and amidst this wreck, is discovered the presence of the undestroyed original. The true idea of our moral nature struggles to assert itself in its own disorganization. God-consciousness, reason, conscience, religious and social instincts, family affections, sympathy of man for man spontaneously rising up to evince the organic brotherhood of the race, organized states, mythic dreams of the ideal and aspirations

towards its actualization in art, religious systems, philosophy, &c &c., all are actively present, showing disorganization, it is true, but holding up to the light, at the same time, the great truth that this moral discord is felt to be foreign to man's true nature, and that it cannot be the essential of his being, but an awful bondage, though self-imposed; a burden of guilt and suffering under which like Prometheus, fettered and helpless, it can only wait for deliverance. The conflict, for conflict it is of self with self, as well as of self with God, would be no conflict, had sin become the substance of our being. Guilt, which in the moral sphere ever connects itself with sin, is at once the evidence that *we ourselves* feel that we are not what we ought to be, that there is an ideal moral harmony which the actual of our life, by its own determination, is contrary to, but which still inwardly, as the very law of our life, makes known its violation in awakened conscience, in loss of self-respect, in painful regrets, and in harrowing remorse. This strange antagonism and conflict must be endless, if there be no supernatural aid, and the very idea of our moral nature end in failure, its whole process prove itself but a voice growing weaker and weaker in the wilderness, with no answer from above, and the felt contradiction between duty and will, between destiny and actual condition, continue in man's consciousness an eternal discord. Such would be history without the supernatural,—a vast movement, sublime even in disorganization, but at every crisis ending in failure and despair, and sinking deeper into the opening abyss of misery and death—humanity, in the image of God, yet groping amidst its own wide-scattered ruins, its consciousness of the Divine uttering itself in an ever unanswered cry, "*O that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down.*"

✓ This is of itself a strong presumption that the supernatural will in some form enter into history to counteract such disorganization. Who can settle down to the awful conviction that the moral world shall end in wreck? Who can acknowledge, seeing in dimmed vision the hidden grandeur of the true and beautiful and good, hovering before him, and yet unreachd,

who can acknowledge, without a fearful surrender of every impulse of his moral nature, that the true idea of humanity shall prove an everlasting failure, a *nisus* only and never completed? While conscience sends strange trembling fears all through our spirit, are there not at the same time strange, mystic, prophetic voices of aspirations and hopes, which, never satisfied and never quiet, wait in travail and in pain for some redemption? Shall all these drop away, go out in darkness? Shall sin be conqueror forever, and everlastingly contrapose Jehovah's work with mocking satire? Shall there be no power to remit and absolve? Is history to be a helpless burden of vanity from its opening to its close? Is the moral nature, higher than the heavens above and deeper than the depths beneath, and more sublime than the whole universe beside, to be bound helpless forever? Will no one come and break the fetters, and take Prometheus from the rock? The very questions, rising up unbidden within the human spirit, form, we may say, a presumption in favor of supernatural interposition.

But to return. Such *would* be history, we have said, without the supernatural: but such it is not. Faith recognizes at once the presence of the supernatural in the order of our life. We say purposely the *presence* of the supernatural; for by Christian consciousness the supernatural is not regarded as an outward theophany or mere wonderwork, apart from man, forcing either adoration or dread, and coming to no inward authentication in his moral nature. Such, to a great extent, is the idea of the supernatural in Heathenism, where in the end it resolves itself into the superhuman merely or contranatural—into mere magic, and thus is destitute of all proper ethical import. From the Christian stand-point, however, the supernatural as a direct manifestation of the Divine, in word or act, in promise or miracle, is viewed as addressing itself to the deepest centre of our moral being, which in its original constitution is intimately allied to it, and which has, though fallen, a capacity for it, a point of contact and a possibility of response. Here and not on the outside, it becomes *revelation* and *inspiration*. The outward manifestation, and the inward susceptibility are so far

✓ brought into harmony with each other, that the unveiling of the Divine is at the same time the lifting up of the human to its apprehension. In so far as it is revelation it is inspiration, not setting aside the order of life in which it comes to pass, but actually so apprehending it as to bring it gradually to a fuller consciousness of its own deepest sense and meaning. In the person of Christ, where the Divine and human do not mutually exclude each other, but form the unity of one personal life wherein the human, apprehending the Divine with the same fullness with which it is itself apprehended by it, and thus perfecting its own idea, loses not but finds itself—in the person of ✓ Christ, the whole meaning of revelation and inspiration, in ✓ their absolute form is reached. It is, as preparatory to this and in its revealing light, therefore, that the presence of the supernatural in pre-Christian history must be viewed.

A twofold preparation seems necessary for the advent of the God-man. This advent reveals itself in Christian consciousness as the introduction of a new and higher life into the organism of history, more comprehensive than it, yet so organically related to it, as to be able at the same time to recapitulate it, and carry it on out of disorganization into its perfection. The introduction of this theanthropic life, however, is not magical. It does not set aside the moral nature of man, forcing entrance arbitrarily and abruptly. Involved, as we believe, in the divine idea of the creation from the start, it already underlies the whole antecedent process of the world as a mystery not yet come, but coming, and forms thus, through history and in it, its own way of access, its chamber and royal hall,—its birth womb in the world.

*"Procedit ethalamo suo
Pudoris aula regia." (St. Ambrose.)*

Hence a twofold preparatory process seems necessary. On the one hand, where the presence of this underlying mystery by direct divine revelation progressively utters itself, and thus becomes an element of trust and hope and moral discipline in man's development, awakening his highest aspirations towards,

and his deepest susceptibilities for, the Divine; and on the other hand, where, on the base of unassisted nature, the revelation being waved away, the development is so left to go on in the midst of struggle and disorganization, as to bring man to a full sense of his helpless need, in which he may realize that under sin all his God-ward aspirations and inward christological impulses, in and of themselves, end in failure. The positive side of this preparatory process constitutes *Judaism*; the negative, *Heathenism*.

History, as already stated, is not only a development of man's moral nature, but through it a continuous revelation of the purpose of God. Revelation, therefore, ever the same in idea, is itself historical. *It* moves onward, in the flow of history, from germ to maturity, opening the way continually for the completion of its own meaning. The thought, prevalent in many quarters, that in revelation a door is opened and a heavenly mystery bursts through upon the astonished world, and that then the door closes as the mystery is withdrawn again from the world, and darkness, for a while suspended, resumes its wonted sway, much as the glare of lightning darts from a cloud and buries itself in another, making for a moment only the darkness visible,—this thought is subversive of the very idea of revelation. It is from above, it is true; having its source immediately in the Divine. It is supernatural, yet as revelation it manifests its presence in history by becoming an element in its movement, and a controlling element also; for the true idea of the world is that which the divine will, through the medium of man's free intelligence, is to realize. The supernatural is a reality quite above the order of nature, but in revelation it comes into the order of nature. The very idea of revelation involves not only the coming down of the Divine to the human, but at the same time the bringing up of the human to the Divine. There can be no revelation where the supernatural stands entirely on the outside of the natural. The two must in some way come together. The full idea of revelation, in this view, is realized when the Divine and human, supernatural and natural actually become one in the consciousness of

life. The Person of Christ, therefore, is absolute revelation. In the mysterious compass of this Person, the Divine and human are included with all that properly characterizes them undisturbed. In Judaism, therefore, as preparatory to this, the revelation of the supernatural is progressive, having its own eras and epochs from the first promise, infinite in its contents, and unfolding through ages as promise and covenant and law and prophecy towards the full realization of its meaning in the Incarnation, whither all looked and tended. But the revelation of the supernatural had not its eras and epochs separate from the development of history. Just because it was not a mere abstraction, or contranatural myth or philosophical speculation, but a divine reality entering the moral sphere, and addressing itself to the deepest wants and susceptibilities and capacities of man's whole being, it had movement and ethical meaning. This is plainly seen in the fact that the antithesis between Judaism and Heathenism was not primarily the result of any arbitrary divine appointment. At first the revelation was of most general character, both in contents and application. It was addressed in undeveloped promise to Adam and Eve, and included, therefore, the whole race, and at the same time was of such character as to meet the very necessities of their condition. At the start, no individual or nation is formally set apart to whom it should especially pertain. In relation to it, however, two classes soon divergently developed themselves, as the genealogy of the Patriarchs from Adam to Noah plainly indicates. Abel, Enoch and Noah mark (see the eleventh chapter of Hebrews) those in whom the apprehending revelation is apprehended, and the way thus opened for its further unfolding. So all the while (we cannot enter into detail), the germinant first promise, progressively and in relation to history, articulates itself, advancing to covenant and law and prophecy where, in inspiration, the Divine and human are in one form already interpenetrating each other; and when, on the divine side, it consummated itself in the Incarnation of the Logos, on the world-side it had carried human susceptibility to its very highest preparatory potency in the woman whose seed was to bruise the

serpent's head. In that precious response to the heavenly salutation and annunciation, "*behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word,*" for which Gabriel waited, and hearing, with joy departed, the moral result of the whole past inspired and inspiring revelation had reached its fullest concentration.

In Heathenism, destitute of all direct divine revelation, and therefore, turned back upon that revelation which confronts man in the sphere of the finite, of self and the worlds—we have a process of an entirely negative character. Not that Heathenism ever so sundered itself from the divine idea of the world's process as to have no historical meaning in opening the way for the Incarnation. It was the unaided self-development of the human to its utmost under the disorganization of sin,* bringing the need of redemption to its deepest intensity, and forcing in its very attempt and failure, the great and necessary truth home to the consciousness, that the capacity of human nature cannot be met and satisfied in this way. The God-consciousness, a characteristic element of man's nature, and not destroyed by sin, had in the case of Heathenism, no proper objective supernatural world to meet it, and enkindle and control its development and activity. Therefore, it sought its object in that which in the finite sphere met that sense of absolute dependence which its own presence ever awakens in the moral nature. Heathenism was nature-religion, and is, therefore, susceptible of two broad divisions, according as the God-consciousness, perverted and without its true object, seeks it, on the one hand, in the objective creation, or, on the other, in the subjective—the human.

* As intimately interwoven with this disorganization, we have in Heathenism the supernatural in the form of demons or evil spirits. This is recognized by the Scriptures throughout; and the polytheistic worship of Heathenism, on this its dark side, may be rightly regarded a demon-worship. So the Apostle Paul speaks of it in first Corinthians. "But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils and not to God, &c." (x. 20, 21); and also again in Ephesians ii. 2. Another feature is also constantly manifest in Heathen polytheism, viz.: a restless dissatisfaction with its assumed supernatural, and an effort to secure something more real, a movement thus in search of the true God. This feature the Apostle Paul also recognizes in his opening address to the Athenians. (Acts xvii. 22).

The former peculiarly characterizes oriental Heathenism, and indeed moulds the whole order of oriental life. The idea of personality seems to have no lodgment in this religion. Mere nature, with its beneficent and hurtful powers, seems to exhaust the supernatural. The infinite of mere power, and this *physical*, and not of will or thought, overshadowing all individuality and personal relations, characterizes in a general way the whole civil and religious consciousness of the Orient. The consciousness of God, not met by God himself, seeks him as an all-absorbing objective, in which the human at last is overwhelmed and lost. God is *the all*, ever opposed to concrete distinctions, or *the nothing*, as remorselessly excluding all idea of individuality. The Heathenism of the West seeks its supernatural in the subjective world. It strives to evolve the Divine out of self, and in a perverted way find God in an apotheosis. Nature is spiritualized, and the personal characterizes the whole sphere of the Divine. Pan, the god of nature, is after all more an apotheosis of the inward impression which the vastness of nature makes, than that vastness itself. The human is continually projected into the objective world. Spirit is realized rather than the mere outward. Nymphs and Naiads, &c., are not personifications of outward nature, but nature etherealized within the human soul. The inner ideal world is to become God. This side of Heathenism reached its highest concentration of effort in the art and philosophy and government of the Greek and Roman world; yet in all these colossal forms, Pelion piled on Ossa heavenward, it still looked out toward a truth and beauty and reality, a unity of ideal and actual, which it could not reach. In the Oriental, God did never really become man. In the Occidental, man did never really become God. Both could supply no divine wisdom to turn to account the vast resources of the nations by either purifying them or directing them to their true end. In Greece and Rome, the whole vast and magnificent structure of Heathenism had no proper foundation or support, no conserving force, and only culminated in its grandeur to crumble away. Just this in Heathenism brought its need of redemption to its height, and compelled it

to find help from above, or despair. Its whole mythology, gods, and demigods, and hero worship, its art and philosophy, its infinite continually excluding the finite, its finite never really reaching the infinite, all is, in this view, a sort of dreamy, visionary sense of a glorious unreached unity, a finite-infinite and infinite-finite, an ideal-actual and actual-ideal, a *God-man*. It could not find it, and yet despairing could not but long for it. "*The light shone in darkness.*" The darkness, though not apprehending it, could not suppress its glimmering presence. Though thus religiously negative, there is yet in one sense a positive movement of history in Heathenism, a developing consciousness of freedom, deepening the sense of guilt and need, and making more clear the discord between destiny and actual condition, and a developing concentration of the results of human efforts, affording material to be assimilated by a higher life, and thus made to enter into the onward progress of the race under grace.

Thus, according to the Christian conception, all history, before Christ, is a development in which the physical and moral and supernatural look toward one great centre and unity, the *God-man*, where their true meaning is reached, and for which they were preparatory both in a positive and negative way.

We come now to the Incarnation itself. As we have already said, this is a fact of history. It cannot, however, be viewed as a result of any of its antecedent processes. It is not a fact co-ordinate in this way with other historical facts. It is the entrance of a new and higher creation, at once comprehending in itself the deepest sense of the whole world process, and thus capable of taking this up in its fallen and fragmentary character, and of carrying it on to its full completion. The conception of it, as a mystery of this character, must be based upon the consciousness which its own presence awakens. It reveals itself in the continuous evolution of its own contents, and is apprehended as life only as it apprehends. Through faith, it opens more and more of its infinite meaning to reason and will, and these, as it penetrates more and more the centre of our life, are made whole and free. It is not our purpose to discuss this mystery

✓ here. We may say, in way of summary, that to Christian consciousness the Incarnation ever reveals itself as the absolute centre of the whole physical, moral, and supernatural world,—the glorious divine-wrought solution of the mystery of the whole universe. As such, it not only *properly* determines our conception of history, but *necessarily*, also, as determining history itself. The Word, who was the life and light of men, who was in the world, not incarnate, but yet controlling its whole movement towards such incarnation, *was made flesh*, and so entered the very constitution of the world's life—incorporated himself into the very movement of history, where he became the abiding principle of a new creative process, transcending the whole previous order of life, of which, however, it formed the crowning consummation.

✓ To faith, therefore, history, from the Incarnation onward, is but the new creation in Christ, asserting its presence and power amidst the surrounding disorganization of sin, in a continuous series of crises or judgments, in which what is false and foreign to the idea of the world is met and condemned, while what is legitimate and capable of assimilation is taken up and moved ✓ onward to its perfection. In other words, it is the first advent of Christ continually, through the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and in the living organism of the Church, unfolding itself into the second advent, in which the hitherto fragmentary world-process shall find eternal rest in the full realization of its idea.

✓ The warrant of such issue rests in the profound truth, that in the person of Christ, we have in our human life, and hence ✓ we may say in the life of the world, the process itself already consummated. Here God and man are forever united: here the human organically from its conception onward through all its crises, through its whole life in the body, and through death, and through Hades, freed from wrath and from guilt, redeemed and atoned, reaches its glorious completion in rising victorious over every foreign element, and entering, body and soul, into its immortality.

"Hic est qui, carnis intrans ergastula nostræ,
 Se pœnæ vinxit, vinctos ut solveret: æger
 Factus, ut ægrotos sanaret; pauper ut ipsi
 Pauperibus conferret opem; defunctus ut ipsi
 Vita donaret defunctos." (Alanus.)

As the very substance and source, in this way, of the salvation and victory, the life of Christ enters our life, and by the mutual indwelling of the two in the Spirit, "*I in them and they in me,*" carries us also in such union onward through redemption and resurrection to glory. (Romans viii. 10-11). The form or organism in which this union and activity are objectively present and continuous in history is the Church. Here Christianity spreads out before us, itself a great sacramental mystery, having its ground in an incarnate and suffering and dying, but now risen and ever-present Redeemer; having its fullness through the descent of the Spirit in the Holy Catholic Church; coming into direct contact with our fallen humanity to redeem it in one baptism for the remission of sin; consciously apprehended, so far as apprehension be possible, by the gift of faith through which it authenticates itself, strengthening itself in us by a confirmation more than earthly, and nourished in us by more than manna, by the flesh and blood of a glorified Redeemer; answering our acknowledged contrition amidst wearying temptations and errors with its comforting pardon; crowning our worship with its hallowed benediction; covering every relation of life, from the cradle to the nuptial altar and the opened grave; moulding history; penetrating art, literature, and philosophy, and all the moral organism of our life, and moving on through conflict, yet with ever-conquering flow, until our ransomed humanity perfected shall see the descending New Jerusalem and enter the pearly gates and walk the golden streets and join the sounding hallelujahs of heaven. Modern history, or history from the first advent of Christ, is *Church history*. All else, from the very nature of the case, as in the presence of the absolute, is subordinate and measured by this. (Ephesians i. 22.)

This Christian conception of modern history we regard as of special importance, for, in the interest of infidelity and rationalism, a quite opposite conception has been rendered popular. In the great work of Gibbon, *e. g.* ("The History of the

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"), the whole narrative and argument fail at every point to bring out the real meaning of the ages of which they treat. The great crisis, in which Christianity, as a new and higher creation, is seen entering the wasting crumble of Heathen grandeur in the Roman Empire, to save its culture and civilization and power, and by sanctifying, use the whole in organizing and culturing the barbaric Teutonic tribes, giving to their fresh untutored vigor a tendency and tone, which otherwise could not have been theirs, and which made possible the now magnificent present of their national life,—this great crisis escapes his vision entirely, and in a cold-polished narrative he passes by, with an occasional sneer, the very central principle which alone could give any proper unity or force to his work. He sees no first-begotten of the dead, and prince of the kings of the earth, moving amidst the golden candlesticks, and hears no celestial trumpet saying, I am Alpha and Omega,—the first and the last.

This especially manifests itself where he attempts to account for the progress of the Christian Church (vol. I. ch. XV). The Christian religion, starting in Palestine, a remote province of the Roman Empire, and opposed by Judaism, on the one hand, and by Heathenism, on the other, in the course of three centuries so established itself throughout the vast bounds of the Roman State, as not only to be recognized, but also to be felt, to be the controlling movement of history. It were strange should no attempt be made to account for this. The mere statement of the fact is enough of itself to awaken inquiry, and challenge the most profound examination. Gibbon attempts to account for the fact in his own way, but fails entirely to understand the mystery and power of the Church, as through patient endurance and heroic martyrdom she takes up into her bosom the deep central current of the world's life, and becomes the great source and centre of advancing European civilization. He is able to survey the decline and fall of the old, but cannot, from his stand-point, adequately appreciate its resurrection and glorification in the new. The darkness seems to pass before his vision, and his eye, so accustomed to its presence, can-

not bear the sunlight which, dawning in the East, spreads out in increasing brightness over the world. A brief examination of the causes, which he regards as sufficient to account for the rapid growth of the early Church in the Roman empire, will sufficiently show this.

The primary cause of this growth, as assigned by Gibbon, is, "the convincing evidence of the doctrine itself, and the ruling providence of its great Author." Yet, as truth and providence do not act magically, but in the midst of the surrounding conditions of history, he develops the meaning of what he regards the primary cause, by discussing those called secondary, which, under five heads, he views as most effectually favoring such a historical result. 1st. "*The inflexible, and, if we may use the expression, the intolerant zeal of the Christians, derived, it is true, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which, instead of inviting, had deterred the Gentiles from embracing the law of Moses.*"

Inflexible purpose, and energy of action, especially when based upon a consciousness of justice, are in themselves powers of no ordinary character. These the primitive Christians had, as their lives and deaths everywhere testify. But it is not within the compass of zeal, however inflexible, to subordinate to its ends vast systems, which result from the processes of centuries. Zeal as *particular*—as *subjective*—as a condition of the active powers of men or bodies of men in reference to some definite end, can never set aside general organizations of history,—can never mould those general movements, which, from the accumulated results of the past, reach out into centuries to come, only as it has its own being and force in something higher than these organizations, and more general than these movements, and is directed to an end more profoundly in harmony with the aim of that providence under which the ages move. There was zeal also in the Jewish and Gentile world, stirred to its very depths, and arrayed against the zeal of Apostles and Martyrs and Confessors and Saints—zeal too, which had in its favor (at least in the consciousness of those who exercised it), the whole order of the civil and religious life of the world—

zeal which nailed Jesus to the cross, martyred his Apostles, and stretched every nerve to destroy the suffering, yet mysteriously growing Church—zeal truly inflexible and intolerant, not legitimately derived from the Jewish religion, but one with the false spirit into which that religion had degenerated. This cause then, however plausibly presented by Gibbon, must be felt to be not only *subordinate*, but absolutely *inadequate*,—powerless, we may say, as regards the great mystery of the spread of the Church during the first three centuries.

2d. "*The doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important truth.*"

Zeal may be said to be in the sphere of will; doctrine, in the sphere of intellect. There may be zeal in propagating a doctrine; but, what Gibbon means, is, that the doctrine as advocated by the Church, is of such character as to have a force of persuasion in itself, convincing reason, arousing hopes and fears, and thus influencing the wills of men. This cause, in the discussion of the historian, involves also the peculiar eschatological views of the early Christians in reference to the coming of Christ in their generation. No one can question but that truth, uttered in a doctrine which comes so immediately into contact with all the solemn questionings of man's moral being, is in itself a great power. The fact, too, that the philosophy of Heathenism gave no secure footing for faith in the future state, and that in Judaism even, a misty veil is made to hang over Hades, may be regarded as a negative preparation for the reception of something more real and definite in reference to man's condition beyond the grave. In doctrine, however, as a mere abstract statement, addressed to the understanding of men, there is no power to transplant a doctrine already lodged there, and supported by traditions and strengthened by associations, only as the doctrine itself is grounded in some higher reality of being, which gives it power to authenticate itself in the reason as being so at one with its own fundamental law, as to challenge in this way the most free and ready assent. The doctrine of a future state as belonging to

Christianity, and the same as held by Jew or Gentile, stand precisely upon the same ground, unless in the one and not in the other, the doctrine is made to rest, not on a logical process or simple credence in an outward traditional revelation, but upon what may be called a concrete exhibition of it in life. The doctrine of the early Church in regard to the future state, was not the clearer enunciation of the immortality of the soul, surrounded with additional circumstances to give weight and influence to its truth; but, on the contrary, the doctrine was referred at once to the person of Christ, where death was really conquered, and resurrection and glorification in and for our humanity were actually reached. The doctrine had its ground in a *fact* of faith. The early Church did not put forward in her Creed any declaration like this, *I believe in the immortality of the soul*, and then attempt to surround this with arguments more potent than those given in the *Phædo* of Plato. On the contrary, she challenged faith and not the understanding with the great supernatural mystery, "*On the third day He rose from the dead*," which necessitated the consequent declarations, "I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting." Now the mere doctrine of the future state, separate from this, its living ground, so as not to carry along with it the power of an endless life, cannot be regarded, with any degree of earnestness, as an adequate cause for its own widespread acceptance, especially when the Church never presented it in such form, and never enforced it in such abstract way. No doubt, it was from the very fact, that the *resurrection* and *life* were felt to be so centred in Christ's person, that the early Church continually watched for the coming of their Lord to unfold the very reality which their faith demanded. They erred in judgment as regards the time, but they erred not in holding firm the glorious and ever-impending supernatural reality "*he shall come again to judge the quick and the dead*." The early Christians did not look forward to death simply, and then, as in its presence, try to realize the existence of that beyond, speculating about Acheron, Pyriphlegethon and Cocytus flowing across the pathway to Hades; they looked for the hallowed mys-

tery of that heavenly world into which Jesus had ascended, as itself to come in upon this order of life with overwhelming pomp and glory in the second Advent of Christ, giving to their struggles and martyrdoms their proper and crowning consummation. It was this, so vividly and continually before the vision of their faith, that swallowed up all mere chronological measurements, and made them stand ever on the threshold waiting with attentive ear to catch the herald cry: "*Lo, the Bridegroom cometh.*" Indeed, what is regarded their error in point of time, is the clearest evidence of the firmness and reality of their faith. Of course, all this Gibbon fails to see, and is busying himself about mere abstractions, and vainly supposing that a mere doctrine is gaining control of tendencies for ages. Neither zeal nor doctrine, both in their genesis subjective, can be regarded for a moment as covering the glorious compass of that divine commission under which the Christian Church labored and conquered.

3. "*The miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church.*" The mere fact that miraculous powers were *ascribed* to the primitive Church, can hardly be conceived as even a subordinate cause by any earnest mind. No system of religion has ever challenged the attention of mankind without the claim of miraculous powers accompanying it. Religion, to be such, must bring home to the consciousness the reality of the supernatural in some form. The wonderworks of Grecian and Scandinavian mythologies are familiar to all. In this respect, as being met by the supernatural in some way, every religion has an element of truth, and shows itself a necessary form of human life. The falsehood rests not in the claim, but in what is supposed really to meet it. Why then, we ask, should the claims of Christianity in this respect, set aside the claims of Heathenism itself? Why should the former sit arbitress, and fearlessly exorcise Gentile demons? If there was no reality in the miraculous powers of either the one or the other, as Gibbon with his earlier compeer, Celsus, seems to think, then the only advantage of the primitive Church over against Heathenism, must rest upon the superior cunning of its deceit.

Craft would be the power, and credulity the condition. This is a shameful travesty of history, a sort of idle profanity under the garb of calm philosophy. But even admit the miracles to be real, and not merely ascribed. In this case, the character of the miracle must be determined in relation to the reason and will of men before whom it is wrought. With the conception that by miraculous powers, the primitive Church forced men to assent, the miracle being the sudden overthrow of their free and conscious being, it might be possible perhaps to account for the increase of the Church. But no such miracles were ever claimed by, or ever ascribed to, the primitive Church. The miraculous, to be a convincing power over the false tendency of an age, must have its being in the supernatural as related to another tendency in whose interest teleologically it is wrought; and thus the question comes back again, how did the Christian Church come to possess such power and with it conquer, as opposed by the whole order of the world's culture and faith, unless in reality it embodied a tendency and power which met the deepest and truest sense of the world's history ideally considered?

There was a signal attempt, upon the part of Heathenism, to confront the whole miraculous element of Christianity with a bold counterpart. A certain Hierocles, taking up the legends and prodigies, which, through a memoir recast by Philostratus, had been made to surround the career of a certain Appolonius, much in the form of a parody on the life of Christ, challenged with them the faith of the world with as good a right, he thought, as the Church did, in making use of the Gospel narratives of Christ. The parody barely remains in fragmentary relics in the writings of Eusebius and Lactantius, while the heavenly melodies of the great poem, which it was supposed to rival, still touch the chords of thousands of enraptured hearts.

4. "*The pure and austere morals of the Christians.*" Were men, in the sphere of nature and surrounded by systems of religious life illy calculated to inspire self-sacrifice, humility and repentance, in favorable condition to receive an opposing sys-

tem of religion just because of its direct opposition to their natural bias and habits of culture, this assigned cause might appear to have some force. But such is not the case. The purity and austerity of the early Christians aroused against them the sinful animus of the whole age. But again, the morality of the early Christians must itself be accounted for. Upon what base did it stand, and how came it into being in such an age, as something quite distinct from the whole order of Heathen life around it? Gibbon say, it rested upon "*repentance for their past sins, and the laudable desire of supporting the reputation of the society in which they were engaged.*" Repentance is negative in its character. It is a consciousness of transgression and condemnation covering the whole life, a sense of insupportable vanity and worthlessness, and of no positive force as such, unless it find completion in submission to what is felt to be a power of deliverance through supernatural grace. Cyprian in his letter to Donatus beautifully confesses this great truth so familiar to the Christianity of his day. "I lay in darkness and blind night, tossed about on the sea of this disturbed life, and dubious I wandered on bewildered, not knowing my life, and a stranger to truth and light. * * * But when, by the aid of regenerating water, the sins of my past life were washed away, serene and pure light from above poured in upon me, * * and in a wonderful manner doubts were cleared up, mysteries were opened, darkness illumined, and power granted to accomplish what before had seemed difficult and impossible." This whole conception of supernatural power, as a new inward principle of life, and thus the very base of Christian morality, Gibbon quietly passes over, and makes the positive element accompanying repentance to be, "*the laudable desire of supporting the reputation of a society.*" This in fact overthrows the very idea of morality, making it a means to an end, and the principle in such form could have no permanent force of obligation. A morality of this kind has no world-conquering power in it. It rests upon no true base, depending upon a sense of sin followed by a sort of utilitarian pride. The morality of the early Christians, as distinct from that of the sur-

rounding world, moved in the sphere of a higher religious consciousness, and may be regarded as the result of a new creative life, entering the will and filling it with holy strength and activity, entering the intellect and bringing into clear consciousness the truth, and making possible the development of doctrines transcending mere philosophy, entering the very centre of life and giving it power both to see and to realize its proper end. In this great movement of new-creating life, this sacramental mystery of heavenly powers reaching our being, the morality of the early Christians was a force invincible; but separate from this it could have no effect in moulding the culture of ages.

5. "*The union and discipline of the Christian republic, which gradually formed an independent and increasing state in the heart of the Roman empire.*" An organized system, into the midst of which men are born and live, and which, as a general power surrounding them, subsumes their whole activity, such as a State or an established Church, and whose unity is one of spirit and form, and whose discipline is both exercised and acknowledged, is beyond question a reality of such force as to warrant the assertion that it will prove effective for its own ends. But the primitive Church was an organized system in the midst of other opposing systems, whose hold upon mankind had been continued for ages. Gibbon seems to regard the Church as an independent State within the empire. This very consideration only increases the difficulty of determining how it finally subordinated the empire itself, how it came to control other counter-systems until they were reorganized under its power.

It is vain to attempt to find in either or in all of these assigned causes anything at all adequate to account for the rapid growth of the Christian Church. The effort is but playing with history. It is a mere array of isolated facts, gathered here and there, without any true appreciation of the grand movement and power of life in which they came to utter themselves. The whole narrative proceeds under a wrong conception of history itself; and yet how much of the same kind meets us year after year!

Now from another and proper stand-point, what do we see passing before our view in the advance of the Christian Church? As facts patent to observation, we see an infant Church struggling with a surrounding evil world. We see her, conscious of the possession of a supernatural life which is to gain ultimate victory over all opposing forces, and expecting for this end the speedy coming of her Lord and head, patiently enduring persecution, and sealing her testimony with blood. We see her growing in spite of every antagonism, defending herself against the literary attacks of Heathenism, and giving birth to an apologetic literature truly sublime in contrast with that which it opposed. We see her examining with vigorous thought the content of her own faith, and securing the foundations of world-enduring creeds, and a wondrous structure of theology. We see her consolidating her organization, and becoming a vast united power in the State, establishing her orders, and worship and practical life with all the freshness of youthful vigor, and with the bold swing of conscious power. We see her meeting the various pre-Christian systems of religious thought which were pressing in upon her from every quarter, and which were drawn on, we may say, by the vast stimulus of her own new and higher principle, yet threatening, on the one hand, to supplant her theology in its distinctiveness, or, on the other, to deform it by foreign admixture. We see her not only meeting all this perilous host of Gnosticism, but also actually sifting the old philosophies and theosophies with her absolute criticism, assimilating all that was allied to her own truth, and casting off all that was alien. We see her in every contest still advancing with the glorious light of victory upon her banner, entering into all the operations of the Roman empire, moulding its laws and habits of action, covering in this way the whole sphere of Grecian and Roman civilization, holding up for a time the crumbling edifice of the Cæsars, till gaining free course for her onward development, and gathering up the world's disciplined resources, she might meet the invading barbarians of the North and christianize and civilize them, and make use of their fresh, impetuous energy for renewed con-

quests of the world. We see all this and more, and is our conception of history such that no satisfactory answer can be given to the question, *What is the ground of it?*

The proper answer is to be found in the following profound statements of St. Paul: first, where the purpose of God in history is said to be, "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ," (Ephesians i. 10): and second, where this purpose is viewed as an accomplished fact, "he hath put all things under his feet and gave him to be head over all things to the Church." (Ephesians i. 22).

In the first of these inspired statements, the various movements of history are regarded as having a divine aim in view. Only in the reality of such aim can there be any proper organic relation of these movements as reaching out to one central completion, any real *πληρωμα των καιρων*. This aim, through the divine will, becomes a guiding law, a *home-law* (*οικονομια*), under which all tendencies look forward to a certain consummation in which, of course, their own true idea can alone be grasped, and their relative orbits rightly assigned. This consummation, towards which every process is made to look consciously or unconsciously as regards the human factor involved, and toward which every process is made to reach positively or negatively, is the gathering into unity under one head (*ανακεφαλαιωσις*) of all the several elements of the world's life in Christ. The development of the Roman State, therefore, a world-process whose magnitude is truly wonderful, was not brought about as though a drifting mass of elements, by some outward force or inherent affinity became consolidated to revolve at random without any end or aim in that divine *pronoia* under which the ages move. On the contrary, there was profound meaning in the whole movement, although the disorganizing presence of sin necessitated its overthrow in so far as it assumed wrong relation to the mystery of Christianity in which alone it could come to have any permanent force or claim of continuance. Christianity, as being one with the divine law of history, as being the very life rather in which history is to be

recapitulated and carried on to its right consummation, cannot but gain ultimate mastery over every world-power. The Roman State had reached that crisis, when its inefficiency, as based upon a nature-development alone, was becoming fully manifest. The time had come when for the very preservation of its preceding centuries of labor and conflict something higher was demanded, and hence the new order of life in the Church so rapidly swept over it.

In the second of the above quotations from St. Paul, the headship of Christ over the Church is made to involve, in way of subordination, his headship over all powers and principalities. The latter is for the former. He is head over all things *for the Church*, just as in the apostolic communion, "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth, go ye, *therefore*." The resurrection and ascension were to open the way for just such a supernatural reality in history as the holy catholic Church. All powers are under the Saviour's dominion, as the Alpha and Omega, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. The decline and fall of all world-systems is, in the unfolding of history towards its consummation, but their subordination to higher ends than can be reached in themselves. Their very efforts to live and their death-throes are so many voices crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord. •

It is only from this standpoint, also,—this full recognition of the presence of the supernatural,—that we can rightly understand the persecutions which the Church endured. Christianity, in claiming to be the absolute religion, claimed by virtue of this the right to set aside all other religions. It could not and be true to its character, combine with them: neither could it be indifferent to the fact of their existence. Had other religions, as relative, felt the true force of this claim, and seen how their own deepest meaning was met in Christianity, they might have yielded without struggle and conflict. But this seems to have been beyond their capacity, and contrary to their disposition, and they arrayed themselves for self-preservation, as they vainly supposed, against the growing Church.

The Roman empire controlled the whole order of religious

life within its bounds. We may say, indeed, that religion had become a State institution among the Romans, so over-mastering had been the tendency of Heathenism world-ward. It is true that in the way of policy some of the conquered nations were allowed to keep their ancient religious rites; but the permission only shows the absolute control which the State claimed to exercise in this sphere. From this connection of religion with the State, the claim of Christianity to set aside other religions would of necessity involve, if carried out, the subversion of the State under its then existing form. Hence the conflict of Christianity with the prevailing religious life of the people, would connect more or less opposition against itself from the civil authority. It must be remembered here, however, that while Christianity claimed as its legitimate mission to set aside all other religions, it did so only on the ground of the superior force of its own absolute truth. It did not array itself as a revolutionary element against the empire, forcing its way to recognition by disobedience to law, by incitements to insurrection, or by hurrying to arms. On the contrary, with an endurance truly wonderful, and with a patience never surpassed, the Christians of the second and third centuries allowed their work to progress, and in its own silent and sure development show itself more general and more mighty than aught which assailed it. Nothing, therefore, we may unhesitatingly say, in the outward acts of the Church, could possibly justify the bitter and malignant persecutions which it endured from the Roman empire for a long series of years. It is important then to ask why the Roman civilization took such a stand of deadly hostility against it? No proper answer can be given by a mere survey of scattered facts. Our conception of history must be able to grasp what underlies the facts, before they can be seen in their true character. The standpoint which we take will inevitably determine our analysis and result.

The Roman State, as well as the religious life animating it, was of an exclusively heathen character. It was a world-power—the result of a development from the basis of mere nature,

where the original tendency of man towards God, not met by direct revelation, was so overwhelmed by an inclination to the world, as to lose almost, if not entirely, the supernatural in the mere idea of policy and government. The vast array of its gods had ceased to carry with them any serious claim to the supernatural. The whole order of worship had become a mere tool in the hands of the State. Those germs of faith which are enclosed in all heathen religions had become so corrupted that obedience to the State had become the very measure of obedience to the gods. Cicero even declares that the gods who are to be worshipped must be recognized by statute. The nation made and unmade its deities. Vespasian when dying exclaims, as quoted by Pressense, "wo to me! I am going to become a god!"

In saying that the Roman empire and religion formed what may be termed an exclusively world-power, we involve the statement that they had in so far become elements of that prevailing tendency of disintegration, the object of which is the subjection of the Divine to the power and law of sin. They were fully in an æon,—a circle of tendencies, in which the prince of this world was working to set aside the government and grace of God. How far the Roman citizen may have been conscious or unconscious of this, does not affect the statement. The tendency so general and controlling, apprehended all with more or less power, and carried the whole force and spirit of the empire onward towards its own bad ends. All this, however, as already intimated, is in itself the very judgment in which the whole reality of Roman culture was put under the feet of Christ; or rather it is the movement which must end in such crisis or prove a wild, colossal failure. The old Apologists and Fathers of the Church are full of this thought. They may not express it in just this form, but it underlies their frequent statement, that evil demons ruled the whole idolatry of Rome.

Now Christianity, on the other hand, was in no sense a world-power of this character. Its base was not in the natural, but in the supernatural. That tendency of man towards God,

which springs primarily from the very constitution of his being as man, but which through sin had been violently distorted, and bent earthward, was met by the very reality towards which it was made to look, a reality coming from the heavenly world, viz., the Incarnation of the Word, through which, in the person of Christ, God and man were brought together in full life communion. The Christian, therefore, conscious that in Christ he had found God, was conscious also that he had reached the absolute religion, in the presence of which every other tendency must yield and give away. In the profound depths of such higher consciousness, in which full satisfaction had dawned upon his spirit, he was impelled as by the force of his own constitution to assert that his faith must conquer the world. Indeed this higher consciousness may rightly be regarded as such victory itself, according to the profound language of St. John, (1 Epistle v. 4, 5).

The Christian Church stood forth, therefore, as belonging to that tendency both of the natural and supernatural, interpenetrating each other, more general than all other tendencies of the world's history, whose ultimate end is the full harmony of the creation with its Creator, the full renovation and restoration and perfection organically of the world. It was no separate æon, as belonging to the order of the world, in which the Christian Church stood, but in the æon of æons, in the *saeculum saeculorum*, the head and organizing principle of which was, "He for whom God made the world," (*τοῦ αἰῶνος*). The early church writers ever kept before them this truth. They could see nothing in the order of the world's life surrounding them but what was felt to be passing away. Their peculiar conception of the immediate advent of Christ is only an evidence of this, growing out of the felt contradiction which the world presented to their faith.

These two great systems, so opposite on account of the presence of sin, were coming together. The light confronted the darkness, and the solemn crisis had come. The hours of judgment were coming to their close. The serpent and the Seed of the woman were actually face to face in struggle. The very

depths of the evil world with its antichristian prince, were stirred by the presence of the life of the Holy One. Hence the terrible onset. Hence the opened gates of hell, and the garments of saints rolled in blood. Only in a view like this can we reach any adequate or correct idea of the terrible persecutions of the Roman empire which poured out the blood of a noble army of martyrs, only, however, to fertilize the mustard plant whose roots were fastening themselves in the life of the ages. Only in a view like this can we appreciate the solemn spectacle of suffering saints, standing on the very verge of the earthly, and gazing towards the heavens, from whence they await their Lord, with the sweet and ecstatic prayer "*even so, come Lord Jesus.*" The persecutions were the death-struggles of thrones and principalities long usurped against Him under whose feet they were being placed.

"Highly they raged

Against the Highest, and fierce with grasped arms

Clashed on their sounding shields the din of war

Hurling defiance toward the vault of Heaven."

It must not be inferred from what we have just said of this necessary conflict between Heathenism and Christianity, that the Church herself was in no sense conditioned by the order of history through which she was moving, and in which her life was developing itself. The supernatural in her constitution is all the while most intimately inwoven with the natural. The Church, not a stiff mechanical formation, but a mysterious supernatural organism, is in fact realizing her own idea in her developing process in the world, and at the same time realizing also the idea of the world, as its movements become penetrated and controlled by her life. The process is organic. The life of Christ, through the Holy Ghost is the informing principle, and human life with all its varying relations is the element in which the principle continually embodies itself. But human life is characterized by intelligence and will, and hence the process, if organic and not the mere working of a power, which from without and in no union with its material, acts only upon it, must move forward as the principle of it on the one hand

apprehends, and, on the other, is apprehended. The Church, therefore, is not what may be termed a developed and fixed formation, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, but involves growth and eras and epochs of development. "Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, *groweth* unto an holy temple in the Lord." (Ephesians ii. 20). In her constitution then is a wide compass of tendencies to be reconciled, which are not at once necessarily in harmony, but often diverging as representing, however, in this or that direction, fragmentary apprehension of the one great central truth and life. The development of such tendencies, even when not in harmony, does not set aside the unity of the process itself. This unity is a living progressive reality, and not a dead, monotonous fixedness, organic in the way of life, and not mechanical in the way of mere fixed and outward proportions. The various tendencies in development do not, we repeat, in their separate character, represent the whole truth of which the Church is the ground and pillar, but rather the different stages of its apprehension in the sphere of human life. They serve, however, to bring about a clearer consciousness of the absolute truth, which the Church possesses at all times as germ developing its contents, and in this way reach out to a higher ground of development than that occupied by either tendency alone, in which at last they find their reconciliation, and the current then moves on with greater force and wider compass. It may be, in consequence of the sinful order of the yet unrenovated world, that these tendencies will in part refuse to yield to the higher position onward towards which they have served to help the process. They are then of necessity set aside as heresies, if in the sphere of thought, and schisms, if in the sphere of will, and thereafter, as a vanquished form of antichrist, fall away because lacking historical substance, and having served their purpose as controlled by God.

The actual world, into whose history the life of Christ was to penetrate, was already a result of vast antecedent systems of culture. We have already mentioned these systems under the

relative antithesis of Judaism and Heathenism. Both these, if not passing beyond their own idea and type, are of course, in full antagonism to Christianity, in which alone either can find unity. Yet both, as being apprehended by the absolute in Christianity, but apprehending this only imperfectly and in a form in which their own previous culture was ever asserting itself, opened the way for two diverging tendencies within the bosom of the Church. The Church instinctively conscious that their ultimate issue must be measured by their relation to that which was most fundamental in the intuition of her faith, viz., the person of Christ, fully reconciled them by reaching in her positive advance a clearer consciousness of what that Person involved, and, by establishing her trinitarian creed, she left behind her the tendencies themselves, which, in so far as they yielded, not to the position gained, fell away in the heresies of Ebionism and Gnosticism, a large, but vanquished foe. In Gnosticism, indeed, we have all the forms of pre-Christian religious philosophy, struggling to perpetuate themselves by combining with Christianity. They seemed to have a more or less clear consciousness that they could be perpetuated only in such combination; and this shows at once that Christianity itself was confronting the world with a new order of life and thought, which were now so powerfully making themselves felt through the Church, as to necessitate a reconstruction of these pre-Christian religious philosophies in reference to it. The historical meaning of such a vast movement as that represented by Gnosticism is to be found in just this, that it marks the process through which, on the one hand, the absolute truth of Christianity was eliminating errors from the developing theology of the Church, and through which on the other hand, that which was of worth in the world's philosophy was preserved by being assimilated and brought into the sphere of Christian life and knowledge. In this very process the Christian truth was showing itself, in a historical way, as the absolute, and therefore, as covering the entire compass of intellectual activity, as a philosophy in germ, in whose development all philosophy, as belonging essentially to human life, should find its own deepest sense

met and realized. This whole inward movement and perilous advance was historical. It cannot be properly appreciated, if on the one hand, Christianity is not recognized as a power of life bringing the objective supernatural really in to the sphere of human thinking, or if, on the other, its absolute truth is regarded as dropped down from the clouds in developed and immovable fixedness. It is through just such crises, as we have said, through just such processes of sifting judgment, and unfolding inwardly and outwardly, that in history and as history, the first advent of Christ is moving into the second. "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." (1 Corinthians xiii. 9, 10).

Not only have we in the Church such an inward process through which her own apprehension of the truth takes positive form in dogma, but also and in conjunction with this, as already intimated, a process in which the essential unity of the Church reveals itself in rejecting schism. The authority exercised in both cases is after all one and the same in its ground, and the outward form of the Church in creed and dogma, is no more real than the outward form in government. One without the other would be found to be entirely ineffectual. Both because in the organism of the Church in which the life and authority of Christ are unfolding their contents, have their proper reality. We may say that in either case it is the life of the Church in its exercise, *i. e.*, this life uttering itself through divinely appointed organs in the form of authority. The dogma and government of the Church, however, can never be said to be fully commensurate with the absolute in these forms, until the absolute truth and law, in apprehending human life, have within its sphere raised it into an equivalent apprehension of themselves. Then only in the objective truth and law the subjective reason and will find their very home and rest. The movement towards this end is the very process in which the Church is realizing her idea and carrying the world to its completion; and the authority, in either case to which we have referred, must show itself a result conditioned all the while by the

historical development through which the Church is progressing. Neither a completed dogma, nor a fixed and completed form of government drops down from the clouds, to be assumed by the Church as a something having no inward organic relation to her life as developing in the world. Nothing of such character comes from Christ. He did not, like some divine lawgiver, at once and by statute-form, fix for the Church modern Presbyterianism or Anglican Episcopacy, or Roman Catholic Papacy. Such action, as outside of history itself, would be in direct opposition to the relation of the Divine and human in his person, and come in the end to a Gnostic denial of the reality of the Incarnation. The living base from which a developed dogma could arise, and from which a developed form of government could be established is most certainly involved in the commission of Christ; but the authority of either as developed therefrom must authenticate itself in our life, and come to be of moral force, not certainly by setting aside the very characteristic of that life, viz., moral freedom, but by showing itself to be the utterance of a real constitution of grace, in which individual reason and will find the very sphere of their highest and freest activity. Reason and will overwhelmed by mere outward force, give no obedience, but the very degradation of slavery.

We have premised these remarks to show that the papal hierarchy which confronts us in history has its proper ground of defence, only in the fact that it is a result, in the developing life of the Church as conditioned by the surrounding order of history, in which the continuous authority of a divinely commissioned ministry came in such force to actualize itself. This view by no means deprives the ministry of its distinctive character as continually having its ground in the risen Christ. Neither does it set aside what is called the Apostolic succession, but rather gives to it proper historical force as reaching over from age to age in a real and not abstract way. The Church does not develop a ministry, as though commencing without one in a sort of free aggregation of individuals who might for social convenience or for didactic interests select a head. On

the contrary, in the development of the Church, the ministry, as a real and essential organ of her life, expands itself, preserving within itself by ordination its distinctive character from age to age, while at the same time applying its authority in a real way to the conditions of history.* More reality is given to the Papacy by this view, than by that which regards it as a fixed form handed down by Christ and in no sense mediated by the advancing life of the Church herself. This view also maintains for it that peculiar historical force which it most certainly showed itself to have in the relation of the Church to the new barbaric element which broke in upon the old Roman empire. To this new crisis, in which the Church is to show her world comprehending activity we now turn.

In the Roman empire, Christianity came into contact with an order of culture and civilization which had already come to maturity. With imperial law Rome governed the historical world, and Greece had before gained the same mastery in the way of philosophy and art. Both, however, had no power to preserve themselves in the forms which they had assumed. They were passing away. Before the wild torrents pouring in upon them from the barbaric North, they would have been swept off in all

* The universal priesthood of believers, held in a sense which would exclude the distinctive function of the ministry, making this a creation from below, and not a power flowing from Christ, and perpetuated sacramentally by ordination is, we believe, a pure fabrication, not found in the word of God. Indeed the universal priesthood of the N. T. is itself such a presentation of the supernatural superiority of the Christian Church over against the O. T. theocracy, as to clothe the order and organic functions of the former only with more overwhelming authority rather than the contrary; and hence the Apostolate transcends in its mysterious official relation to the heavenly world, the whole scope of priest and prophet going before, because having to do directly with the very realities of the heavenly world and not with shadows and types thereof. The prophetic and priestly and kingly offices of Christ are not separate functions disconnected with the mystery of his divine human life, as though he had assumed them merely to fulfil what had gone before. They are the very forms in which that life must utter its own reality. To suppose then for a moment that Christ's presence in the Spirit does not from the very nature of the case perpetuate their mysterious reality in history, is simply to deny in the end that that life comes to any real authentication of itself in the world. The N. T. Scriptures are themselves the outflow of the prophetic function of the ministry itself as ordained by Christ. "And he gave some, apostles and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and some pastors, and teachers." (Ephesians iv. 10, 11).

probability as cumbrous wrecks, if dependent upon their own power of resistance and defence. How could they stand before the pent-up storm bursting in upon them from over the Alps and Pyrenees? The Church, however, gathered up into her bosom what otherwise in these forms must have yielded and crumbled away. Not that in her constitution, in this way, the human was set aside, and no longer kept its identity. Christianity did not become, it is true, simply Roman civilization and Roman policy; but these now found in the fact of their assimilation by it, their own distinctive characteristics still preserved, to be made only more efficient and active in the transition to something higher. Grecian philosophy and Roman rule, the vast theoretical and practical results of two great and distinctly characterized tendencies of history, were not, and indeed could not be, arbitrarily set aside by the Church. This is evident at once from the fact, that within her bosom they were really preserved in their peculiar distinctiveness. The actual movement of the Church in the Grecian sphere was predominantly inward and speculative. Here in the Greek language, itself a philosophy and art, and in that life of peculiar inward thoughtfulness so characteristic of those to whom this language was vernacular, the new creation wrought, constructing that theology, and Christology and pneumatology, which, in depth of speculation and artistic finish of expression, challenge the admiration, and almost set at defiance the criticism, of the present age. Here the philosophic spirit of ages, through no forced exorcism of itself, nor in passive indifference, but penetrated and made even more active by the divine revelation, yields to the new creation which apprehends it, and yields in *active* obedience, moulding the contents of faith into classic forms for thought. The Church, no less really in the sphere of Roman life also, took up the practical world with its distinctive characteristics. Her own movement here shows the same conditioning presence of the life she apprehended. The interests of will, the organization, and consolidation of government, and the more practical investigations of anthropology and soteriology, here continually come into sharp articulation. The whole

Roman type of life is still preserved. Thus the Church did not stand apart from the order of history which confronted her in the Greek and Roman worlds, as though by some ghostly and magical power, she must, to authenticate her presence, level all before her; but she entered in most living way into their very organism, took up their spirit, and thus made the old creation continually resurgent in the new. She showed herself possessed with a life truly all-comprehensive, just because she could really retain the two in their undisturbed distinctiveness, and at the same time hold them together in the deeper and broader base of her own constitution. In her bosom, indeed, all the great powers and processes of human life in history must come together in the unity of a life so comprehensive and so intensely human, that their peculiarities are not lost, but found to be no longer dissevered fragments, but real co-efficient elements of one great living organism.

When the Church had thus gathered up into her own bosom the characteristic culture of both Greece and Rome, there came on to the stage of history a new power, in direct antithesis, we may say, with that of the Roman empire, viz., the barbaric element of the North. Both in their origin were heathen; but the one, when confronted by Christianity, a developed result, the other, a fresh and vigorous life not yet developed into any mature or settled organic form. It was no mere accident that, as thus conditioned, the two came at this time to meet in conflict, when the Church was so well qualified to become the great mediating power. Having already entered the old, taking up and preserving what was of real historical force in it, the Church, now strong and fully organized, was prepared to meet the new, and to penetrate and carry on the development of the vast and rude elementary forces of modern Europe.

We have already remarked that history does not move in self-repeating cycles. The old may be taken up by the new, but not as an outward form which is to be the necessary measure of its own life and contents. The civilization of the barbaric tribes, when having come to its maturity, cannot be the same as the old civilization of the Roman empire. It would

be contrary to all right conception of history and of the Church, to suppose that the Teutonic and Slavic North should engross centuries of vast activity, and take up under Christianity the very central current of the world's life, only to retard the whole progress of development by coming to be in the end nothing more than a mere copy of Greece and Rome. They had their own mission (not yet accomplished even), their own historical future, their own higher results to reach in the onward march of ages. The Church, therefore, as involving in herself the central principle of the world's true movement,—the life and power in which alone history can reach its proper end, could not but authenticate her presence and activity through all the varying crises of the barbaric world. On the base of a national antithesis between the developed Roman civilization in the Church, and the independent and undeveloped barbarism, there arises an entirely new relation between the Church and the world. The Church, now fully organized, with a developed system of dogma, with a consolidated hierarchy, and with all the finished forms of Roman and Grecian culture, the language and legislation, the philosophy and art, of the Roman empire, in so far as these were taken up by her life,—the Church, we repeat, as a fully organized power in history, came now to stand face to face with impetuous tribes, whose whole order of life was in formation, whose boundless self-will was struggling, as a vast independent force, towards something quite distinct from imperial Rome. This new spirit and power, opening the way for its development in history, must have place in Christianity,—must find room in the Church to bring its own mission to a proper solution. The Church must prove herself comprehensive enough to hold in her constitution the Christianized Teutonic world without setting aside, in so doing, its distinctive and historical import. The whole development of the barbaric tribes was stimulated of course by the finished culture and civilization which confronted them, and was conducted within the organism of the Church: yet ever on the base of their own new and peculiar spirit did it move onward. We find, it is true, at the close of the first period of advance,

in the barbaric world in the sphere of politics, the vast empire of Karl the great. Yet in this form, we have no mere continuation of the old Roman life. Everywhere was manifest the presence of a new spirit in activity, which quickly dismembered the vast dominion, and made its broken fragments germs of new national developments. Rather, we may say, these germs, already enclosed in the Frankish monarchy, necessitated its dissolution. The bonds which held them together were outward, and the unity of the empire itself not an organic growth, but something imposed by the brilliant genius of Karl himself. Hegel well styles the whole political system of Charlemagne "an *a priori* constitution, something superficially induced and not based upon the spirit of the people,—not having become a vital element in it." Interpenetrating, however, at every point, this colossal monarchy, was the ecclesiastical hierarchy centered in the Pope, and challenging and gaining the submission of the people. The former (the empire) we see dissolving and giving room for the free play of separate national life. The latter (the papacy) we see maintaining still its form and increasing its authority to control the issue of such dismemberment, and hold in check so far as possible the forces which were at work. Tumultuary as these forces were, yet there was meaning and aim in their agitated movement. They formed not merely a negative process, breaking up all authority and unity, but mark in reality a significant struggle through ages to reach a unity more real, in which the general and individual might be in harmony,—in which the authority of the one might not ever stand in an arbitrary overthrow of the other, giving only an obedience of slavery, but both meet in reconciliation,—a *struggle toward freedom*.* This seems to have been the historical

* Of course, from a mere survey of the period in which these forces were in tumultuous and apparently almost chaotic confusion, one might easily fail to see their underlying aim and tendency: but there must be embraced in such survey a more advanced period wherein they come to characterize more distinctly their meaning and purpose. This is by no means an unhistorical method of investigation, but the only one which can satisfy at all an inquiring reason. Who, e. g. in merely surveying the developing activities of a plant, in its first elementary stages of growth, can come to any full consciousness of the aim of its movement, without he first discover from its blossoming and maturity a centre from which the whole antecedent movement becomes intelligible to thought.

problem, especially of the Germanic world: and hence, as a sphere for its active solution, Germany, most inflexibly bound to the old barbaric type or spirit, as is evident from its persistent preservation of the vernacular language, became not long after the dismemberment of the Frankish empire, the central political power rather than either France or Italy. It must not be supposed that this struggling Germanic spirit was essentially antagonistic to Christianity. Though in frequent conflict with the peculiar tendency of the Papacy, it had however entered fully into the organism of the Church,—and with the capacity also of forming an element there, in which Christianity might come to a still higher stage of development in the sphere of human life. While Christianity is authority, and that of the most absolute character, it is also freedom in its deepest and broadest sense. It gives room for the very highest individuality by realizing for every personality, as a thought of God, its true distinctive perfection. Indeed only in Christianity can there be true freedom,—a full unity of law and will, of truth and reason, in life; and hence the Germanic spirit, as poised towards freedom, could never accomplish its appointed mission except in the Church and in the spirit and life of faith.

Within the bosom of the Church, therefore, we have two tendencies, both from the conditions of history necessary, yet with the possibility, and we may say with the necessity of reconciliation, viz., a tendency towards independence, or rather towards freedom on the side of the individual or subjective, a sense of which formed an underlying element of the whole Teutonic world from the start: and a tendency in which an already organized authority is holding the other tendency in check. These tendencies might come into direct antagonism, when, in the one, the struggle towards freedom should move towards lawlessness or mere self-will, or when, in the other, the organized authority should assert itself as outward and arbitrary, moving towards tyranny.

No one, we think, can fail to perceive these two tendencies throughout the Middle Ages, in more or less bold antagonism with each other. As evidence of this, we must rapidly survey

the process of history from the time of Charlemagne to the close of the Middle Ages, yet with such necessary brevity as to run the risk both of being misunderstood and misrepresented. The dismemberment of the Frankish empire of Charlemagne, to which we have already referred, shows the restlessness of the barbaric world under such outward restraint. The division of the vast dominion was no mere dynastic act. It was the repressed activities of nationalities bursting the fetters imposed upon them by a dominion in which they could gain no proper sphere for their own energies, and in which their growing consciousness of their mission could not satisfy itself. In his scheme, "grand and benevolent as it was, Karl was overborne by the tendencies of his times. All the deeper impulses of the nations were towards independence rather than unity; he could not reverse or control them; Germany was stronger than Rome, feudalism than imperialism. The sublimest legislative genius can do no more than arrest for a moment the great currents of social force." (Parke Godwin's *Ancient Gaul*) The oath at Strasburg, between Louis and Charles and their respective subjects, shows, from the fact of its not being in Latin, but in the Romance tongue for the one party, and in the German (undeveloped) for the other, that a France and Germany were fast organizing. Indeed, the treaty at Verdun between the three kings shows already a distinctive Germany and France and Italy. The empire, as a sort of outward plan, after the old Roman type, was in fact a compulsory union of elements too independent and self-willed to be thus held together. The barbaric impulse not incompatible with, but really stimulated by, Christianity, was not towards such arbitrary unity, but towards freedom, a freedom, however, not yet clearly distinguished from a mere following of its own impetuous self-will. As yet, therefore, the central and controlling hierarchy of the Church was essential to hold together, under the proper restraint of an objective, divine kingdom, this necessary but perilous disintegration. It continued in its form, and naturally concentrated and increased its authority more and more to meet the surrounding conditions of history, but en-

dangered at the same time its capacity and disposition under such form, to reconcile instead of overriding the deep, earnest, struggling spirit itself. Imperialism gave way, and the freed elements sought mutual protection and self-defence in what was more congenial, viz., Feudalism. But Feudalism could not satisfy the aroused spirit of the nations. In its caprice and violence, made even more wide-spread by its necessary individualization of power, the tyranny of Feudalism was no less arbitrary than that of Imperialism; and a wilder play even of passions and self-will was the inevitable result. The Church, in the midst of this social disintegration, sought an independence for itself, and came into conflict with the secular power, and now there seemed to be but one issue possible, viz., chaos and anarchy. Endangering the possibility of her own proper interpenetration of the spirit of the age struggling towards something politically more real and free, and yet within her own organism, the Church, by a kind of historical necessity maintained and advanced her authority, covering with it all the relations of politics and science and art, and reaching out, through Hildebrand, to a world-embracing theocracy, enclosing within itself the whole religious and civil life of the nations, but under such an outward sway as to ignore almost entirely the moral sphere in which men while obedient must be freely so by not losing the activity of their own reason and will. The Hildebrandian policy could not succeed, however, without most earnest and bitter conflict. Hildebrand himself dies in exile, and only as the nations, worn out with intestine warfare, are diverted from the more inward problem of their own life, in a sort of wild enthusiasm, to the most external in the interest of Christianity, viz., to the recovery of the Holy Land, did his policy gain temporary victory. In the Crusades, the Church gained her highest point of external authority, but not by a true interpenetration of the Germanic world with that living spirit of Christianity in which its own spirit might find itself qualified to go onward in the completion of its mission. Through conflicts and defeats, by councils and by diets, the Germanic spirit still sought to realize its proper contents. We see em-

perors, and princes, and knights, and free cities, and peasants, all in resisting authority, seeking liberty and authority for themselves; and in the fifteenth century, the subordinate powers rally against both Emperor and Pope, to reach a constitution and monarchy, in which there should be law and reason, and not mere irresponsible power. The whole movement of the Germanic world was, we may say, when rightly viewed, although within the Church, towards a freedom which was sought in vain in either Church or State in their then organized forms.

If we now turn to the sphere of theology, we shall see a process in which a kindred antagonism manifests itself. The Church confronted the barbaric world with a system of dogma, already developed, and through most serious activity of thought. The dogma thus to the rude and untutored barbarian, came from without and was at first acquiesced in without much inward assimilation, as having already reached its form through severe intellectual struggles. This legacy the barbaric world received. But this was not enough. Its spirit must in the end make it truly its own by an inward apprehension of its truth. In Scholasticism we have an effort to give to it a scientific form to bring it into the schools, under the full conviction, however, that it was the absolute truth. Even here we see a tendency to make the external dogma more inward by rendering it intelligible to thought. Scholasticism stimulated inquiry, while in one sense it was designed to repress it. It was an impulse of science, and roused the intellect and set it into activity. Abelard with his "*Sic et non*" no more stimulated inquiry by endeavoring to bring confusion into the opinions of the Fathers, than did Peter, the Lombard, by endeavoring to compile the same into a harmonious system. This process, however, never satisfied the German mind, and we find it predominantly characterizing the Romanic nations, in whom the old barbaric type had to a great extent disappeared. (*Die Philosophie des Mittelalters gehört nicht der Zeiten an wo das deutsche Element die Herrschaft hatte, sie ist vorherrschend Romanische Natur.*" Ritter, as quoted by Milman). It was confined exclusively to the Latin language although under the impulse of Greek and

to some extent Arabic philosophy. It was never inward enough, however, for the real Germanic spirit. It was not congenial in its tone or method. It did not penetrate the soul, and reach the profound depths of life. It carried the dogma to the intellect, but did not enter the heart. More consonant to the German mind, on this side of its activity, was the process of mysticism, where the mind sinks back into itself, finding faith, not simply in an outward obedience to a system of dogma brought merely to thought and rendered intelligible in way of scientific statement, but finding faith in the life in whose mysterious depths God is operative, and the truth reveals itself. Mysticism, while in full obedience to the Church, was after all inwardly and in its whole process opposed to scholasticism, and yet scholasticism met with most unequivocal favor upon the part of Papacy. The '*Magister Sententiarum*' ruled the schools, and Thomas Aquinas was the canonized saint of Mediæval orthodoxy. Mysticism, however, did not satisfy the spirit which cultivated it. It rather served to open the way for that spirit to reach out to a position in which the absolute truth of divine revelation should really authenticate itself such in the sphere of human life, and bring reason and will into harmony with itself. In the movement towards such end, a continual opposition was awakened to mere externalism, to mere outward legalism, to arbitrary tradition, to everything which came to no real inward evidencing of itself; and in this, a tendency shows itself quite parallel with the political one to which we have referred, and over against which the Church continued the same external and formal authority. Political freedom and Christian liberty continually hovered before the Germanic world, and could not be reached, as we have said, either in State or Church as then constituted. The inevitable collision and open conflict came in the sixteenth century. Notwithstanding the broad and necessary issue, the Papacy strove to assert its authority as before and in the same arbitrary way, unwilling either to see its own abuse of power, or to show itself broad enough to meet the historical conditions of the age. The deep, earnest spirit of the Germanic world struggling for

ages, and now disciplined and cultured and penetrated by Christianity, rose up from within the Church itself in solemn protest, and sought the solution of the problem forced upon it by its own inward genius, and now made doubly important by its own Christian consciousness. It would have been treason to its own conscience and moral sense not to have done so. The Papacy, failing to reconcile the tendency with itself, and failing to conquer it in its progress, cast it off as something foreign to itself, and continues to show the same strange arbitrary judgment by calling its subsequent centuries of development the mere play of antichrist, or the vain opposition of heresy and schism. Notwithstanding its birth and growth within her own organism; notwithstanding the fact of its central import in modern civilization; notwithstanding the fact of its having taken up almost the whole progressive current of German national life into its own bosom, it is still refused to be regarded by the counter force which cast it off, as even mediating in any way a transition of the Church to some higher and more glorious (because more free) unity and authority. Such, however, we believe must be the final issue, the dawn of which as yet seems far below our horizon. No Christian conception of history can well maintain that a thousand years of development should only end in carrying entirely away from the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church the main historical force of that new Germanic world, which rose upon the ruins of the Roman empire with such glorious promise, under Christianity, of something higher and better. The character of this article does not allow us to trace the development beyond the Reformation, either of Protestantism or Roman Catholicism. Their continuance in history with such vital, and we may say, undiminished force, shows that some problem yet unsolved demands their activity. We dare not attempt to conjecture what ground in the end may be reached, where their present contrast and antithesis shall be reconciled. They must, however, pass through crises and struggles in history, before the absolute truth of Christianity shall in higher form of apprehension, comprehend them both in such integration of prin-

ciple as to answer at once their deepest meaning. Not by mutual abuse, neither by covering up with false charity the dangers and perversions of either, but by an earnest study of the peculiar historical meaning of both, and the mission involved in their continuance, and by a serious consciousness of Christ's continued presence in the Church and history, will the way be opened to realize the now hidden promise of the future.

There is one feature yet, which distinctly characterizes the Christian conception of history, and to which we have but casually referred, viz., the recognition of the presence and activity of Satan and his subordinates in the world. Satan is not viewed, in the light of Christianity, as simply the evil of the world generalized in thought, and then personated under this name. He is himself personal, possessed with intelligence and will, although self-perversed and in sin—a fallen one of the heavenly hierarchy. His activity, however, is not viewed as merely upon the world from without, but as in the world. *He* also, not of course, in the absolute form in which Christ does, enters history, incarnates himself as far as possible in its process, and in this way stands in mocking and active antagonism to Christ. Before the Incarnation, as we have said, the pre-existent Logos was intimately related to the world. The world as created was a cosmos just because in the Logos it was related to a divine and rational idea of which through creation it became the utterance. Satan, therefore, reveals his activity primarily as *anticosmical*, striving to disintegrate the creation from its own law, striving to so disorganize it that its own movement might be self-destructive. Before man comes on to the stage of being, as the full integration of the antecedent process in self-consciousness and personality, Satan seems to have been present, and the "*tohu vah Ohohu*" of Genesis may be regarded as the result of his anticosmical activity. In the creation of man, a moral process was involved, in which willing God's will, man should go onward to the full positive completion of his life. Satan's activity now concentrates against man. Man was to replenish and subdue the earth. Satan strives to bring him under its subjection, and himself usurp the

lordship and become *prince of the world*. Man was to keep the garden. Satan strives to make him lose it. Man was to gather up the whole of nature in his own person, and bring it freely to the obedience of the divine will. Satan strives to break it upon man's self-determination, and gather the whole universe under his own dominion and make it servant to sin. The Logos became incarnate. Satan now as *antichrist* strives to incarnate himself in the human. He tempts Christ, sifts Peter, and enters Judas, the Apostle, and yet son of perdition. In history subsequent to the Incarnation, as the life of Christ continually unfolds itself, so Satan strives to incorporate himself with the process, and disintegrate it, reaching down continually into the human, until in the end he reveals himself as the *man of sin*, *i. e.*, until the human in its highest historical force under sin, becomes his own concentrated medium of destructive agency, his mock incarnation. Satan, thus entering into the sphere of history, cannot do so arbitrarily, however. There is, in the activity of every relative principle, what may be termed a side of temptation, and it is just here that he insinuates his presence. Man's characteristic was that of self-activity. In his consciousness there is a self-contained existence. But self-hood, though not by any means necessitating selfishness, has within it a possibility of it; and just here Satan becomes active to realize by seduction this bad possibility, and turn the highest creature back upon himself and away from God, in the very perversion of his noblest characteristic. So in history, in every tendency, however legitimate, there is involved the possibility of an inward perversion of itself. In Roman Catholicism, the principle of authority, itself of most necessary importance, has the possibility of showing itself mere arbitrariness, bold externalism, and tyranny in which the subjective is quite overwhelmed. The antichristian activity of Satan in this sphere will ever be characterized by bringing this possibility into full reality, that the authority may become immoral, and self-destructive. In Protestantism, the very principle of freedom, asserted with such necessary earnestness upon the side of the subjective, involves in itself the possibility of

sinking into mere individualism as regards organization and worship; mere independent rationalism as regards faith, and mere subjective feeling and false spiritualism over against the whole objective mystery of Grace. The antichristian activity of Satan will here reveal itself, by giving to this possibility its boldest actuality; and inasmuch as Protestantism is of such central historical force, and its principle of such fundamental import, its involved possibility of disguised antichristian activity is of the most serious and dangerous character, threatening the very perversion of the principle itself by carrying it ✓ into a process at every point self-destructive. It needs but little earnest observation to mark this perversion as now at work, especially in American Protestantism. The multiplication of sects, evincing a spirit whose irreverence for history is only equalled by its ostentatious reverence for self, and whose instinctive hostility to the whole idea of a supernatural constitution of grace as confronting men in the Church, shows at once its antichristian character; the persistent centering of worship upon inward and individual emotions, in the interest of what is termed *free prayer*, without any sense of a *divine presence* at the altar which is strangely regarded as bondage to mere form; the heroic effort to sink faith in the sphere of mere thinking and feeling, the lowest form of rationalism, cutting off the very organ for the supernatural from all connection with anything sacramental as opening in its presence the real contents of the heavenly world, and because forsooth the Sacraments may become only empty forms by being regarded as having contents of grace for faith; the pious exaltation of preaching the Gospel, placed in opposition and antithesis to baptism, as though the Holy Ghost in opening the way for the mystery, opened the way at the same time to dissipate that mystery itself, and as though trust might in some way be made to rest in vain ceremonies, when without the real presence of the Spirit in them, they ought to be discarded as empty and an unnecessary burden, not challenging faith, and only disquieting the pardoned soul; all this only shows how widely the perverting power is operative, and warns us to labor to unmask more

thoroughly the evil to bring it to judgment and condemnation.

In the end, all the bad possibilities of the world, as actualized through history and concentrated against Christ, reveal themselves in the *man of sin*, in Satan in his completest incarnation in a human personality, the highest form of created power. But, over-against this revelation, is the new creation in Christ, the God-man, infinitely more real and powerful, which under its exalted head shall be victorious in glory in that last great crisis and judgment, in which the first advent of Christ has at last developed through history into the second.

"Dies illa, dies vitæ,
Dies lucis inauditæ,
Quæ nox omnis destruetur,
Et mors ipsa morietur!"

• • • • •
"Oh! beati tunc lugentes,
Et pro Christo patientes
Quibus sæculi pressura,
Regna dat semper mansura."

ART. V.—THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN THEOLOGY.

BY E. V. GERHART, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOL. SEMINARY, MERCERSBURG, PA.

ALL life is historical. The converse proposition is equally true. All history is a life movement, or an organic process.

An organic process is not governed by a power outside of itself, but it carries in its own bosom a law which determines its character—a law in virtue of which, the hidden fulness of life, which constitutes the relative beginning, comes forth in the way of genetic evolution, maintains itself with more or less steadiness against various hostile forces, and finally, after surmounting obstacles and passing through the successive stages answerable to the informing idea, attains to its end in a complete actualization, as to contents and form, of what was originally enveloped in the relative beginning.

The beginning is *relative*, because it supposes a more general life power in which it stands, and by which it is originated.

The evolution is a continued transition of being from one stage of life to another. The transition is not merely transformation, a change of manner or form of existence; nor is it the extinction of one type and law, and the introduction of another; but it is a change that is both inward and outward, constitutional and phenomenal; and yet through the entire transitional process there is no change at all. Determined by an immanent law that is alike necessary and unchangeable, the successive stages are only so many states and aspects of existence of one indestructible type, the rich nature of which is unfolded in the process.

The end of an organic process is identical with the beginning, the fruit with the seed; and yet in one view it is the opposite of it, and superior to it. The end is in the beginning, and the beginning is in the end; but not in the same sense. The end is in the beginning potentially; the beginning is in the end completely developed and actualized. Thus, whilst the two are the same, the end stands opposed to the beginning as the actual stands opposed to the possible; and it is superior to it as being the highest realization of the invisible type, and the most perfect revelation of the original intention.

Such an organic process, taking a broad view, is *history*. It is the new creating-movement of organized life, or the spontaneous growth of a germinal principle; the ultimate aim being to realize the infinite contents of the germ through the medium of manifold forms of existence in perfect fruit. Fruit is the fulfilment of the promise given in the germ.

But the idea of history does not obtain with the same degree of propriety and fullness in all spheres of organic existence. Whilst we may predicate the historical even of the mineral kingdom, where the plastic powers of life are wanting altogether, inasmuch as the mineral enters into and conditions the intention and movement of the entire cosmical order, yet instead of history proper, we have in the kingdoms of organic nature standing below the human, no more than a beautiful but imperfect pre-

figuration of the truly historical—a movement that is indeed not external and mechanical, but internal and dynamic, yet one that turns upon and into itself, like the circumference of a circle, and never transcends but ever repeats, from age to age, the product of the first period. The history of the first generation of any species of animal is, essentially, the history of the last. There is no self-conscious, determinative power, but a blind necessity which carries the plant and the animal through an unmeaning and incomplete cycle; unmeaning, because their intention appears not in themselves, but in their concrete relation to what is higher; and incomplete, because the true nature of organic life is actualized only in humanity.

Here, now, there confronts us in man, the sphere of ethical existence, the true nature and purpose of mundane life, and therefore the true idea of that organic movement in which the distinctive character of history consists. Here there is a superior life, a life that is personal, and as such stands in the unity of conscious thought, free will and psychical feeling. Yet, as the human kingdom supposes, appropriates and comprehends all the essential forces which prevail in the inferior orders of existence, and as these forces condition, limit, and even mould the activity of the soul and spirit of man in his relation to all objects, natural and spiritual, we must distinguish manifold spheres of history in this higher region. These spheres of history are not co-ordinate; but they rise above and enter into each other organically. They are so joined together and compacted by that which each constituent element supplies, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, that humanity maketh increase of itself in the unity of its idea, until that idea informing the living process and wrought out in it, glorifies itself in the perfection of spirit. This glory, whether ever fully realized or not, is at least the divine intention which necessitates and ennobles the terrible convulsions, and seeming contradictions and failures which mark the history of our fallen race.

In the sphere of the human spirit, accordingly, we have an organic process also, just as we have in nature; but a process

that is intelligent and free, and for this reason a process that is in the proper sense *historical*. The life-movement is governed by an internal law, but it is the law of personal life. The law is active spontaneously, and anterior to self-conscious, ethical action; and it determines the nature of the movement as organic in distinction from mechanical, and concrete, in distinction from abstract. But the movement is in personality, in an order of life which, as to its essence, is the unity of thought and will; and is therefore mediated and conditioned, at all points, and in all its stages, by consciousness and the free activity of will. I must know myself in order to be myself truly. I must know the law of my personal life, in order that I may do the law, and thus realize the type of my being as human. On the other hand, it is equally true that I must will to be myself, in order to know myself; and I must do the law of my higher life, in order that I may know that law and the end of that law. There is no contradiction. For thought and will do not stand outside of each other, and hence cannot be said to come together. Thought and will are in each other. Though distinct, they are one in personality; just as the formative and materializing powers are one in the life principle of the plant. Each one both involves and conditions the other. Otherwise there can be no proper personal activity.

Now, it is just this living necessity determining the unity of thought and will, and requiring all consciousness to be free, and all moral action to be intelligent, which constitutes ethical law, or the law of personal life, and distinguishes it from natural law, or the law of the organic world lying below man.

From this view of the law of personal life, two things follow. The one is, that history, or the organic process in the sphere of spirit, is not abstract but concrete; the other, that history is not a circle, nor an endless repetition of circles, but it advances upon itself from age to age.

History is concrete. The human spirit does not stand apart from the human body, but being united to it, constitutes with it one organic whole. Possessing aptitudes that are infinite, and struggling towards an end that is transcendent and eternal,

man stands in a finite order and is active always, and can be active physically and ethically only, in time and space. Nor is man isolated from the material world. His life is inwoven with all living and lifeless existences belonging to nature. This relation of spirit to the natural, involves the natural in the organic movement of history. It comprehends not only systems and methods of thought, and the character of public sentiment, not only philosophy, science and the arts, but the social organism, the outward style of life, and the physical world. The process changes the face of the earth no less than the face of society; for these are only different sides of the same movement.

History is also essentially *progressive*. No age can perpetuate itself. What is peculiar and distinctive belongs to it alone, and as that period of life sinks into the past, making room for a new one, distinctive peculiarities sink into the past also, nor can they ever rise again in their original character. The attempt to hand down to posterity the social condition, or the method of thinking of any given period, is arbitrary; and the result a caricature, or a monstrosity. As well might one think of perpetuating a little child, or a young man, for half a century. A swelling bud cannot remain a bud; nor a blooming flower remain a flower. Even the central idea and the ruling tendency of an age, cannot hold their position as such, and continue to affirm their original relations. So long as a central idea or question continues to be central, the peculiar age holds sway. Not until the reigning ethical forces fulfil their mission, and thus come to a relative conclusion, can a new age dawn upon the world. Indeed, the very conception of an age, or period of history, implies that an old principle asserts its presence in a new form, or a new principle assumes controlling power.

Yet an age does not die and rot like a tree; neither its distinctive peculiarities, much less the central idea. One age is the basis and condition of another; and passes over into it, like the bud into the flower, and the flower into fruit. A succeeding age is only the life of the preceding one, advanced to another

stage of development. The mystery of human life, in one view, transcends itself; but, in another view, it carries itself in its own bosom.

What is phenomenal or particular, is transient; it is left behind and disappears. So, too, whatever performs an office which is, for the time, but the condition of the general process, falls away as being no longer necessary. But these are left behind only in a relative sense; like the first leaves of a stalk of wheat, or the rough, outside bark of an oak. A particular phenomenon performs its function, then ceases as such; but the formative influence which it exerts, is taken up into the process, and thus lives on through succeeding ages.

On the other hand, whatever is essential and general, belongs to the fullness of the principle, like the trunk of a tree, or the lungs and heart of the human body, and must, therefore, perpetuate itself; but it perpetuates itself organically, not mechanically. Even the central idea, the central tendency, cannot be handed down traditionally from one generation to another, much less from one period of history to another. Were this so, then history would simply repeat itself; like the animal kingdom in successive generations of the same genus. It would be a series of monotonous circles. But the central idea lives. It pervades, informs and controls the ethical life of humanity. This implies that the idea is continually re-wrought afresh. The informing, plastic power is spontaneous; but it involves, at every point, conscious reflection, and the free activity of the will. Thus, whilst the idea or tendency works, impels, energizes and fashions humanity according to its own law, and remains true to its general type, it is at the same time reproduced continually by the independent power of the human spirit, which, whilst conditioned by all its concrete relations to the natural world, is, nevertheless, always active according to its own intuitive forms of thought, and according to the self-lawgiving force of will. The spontaneous process being thus necessarily mediated by the free, independent power of man, the central idea changes and must change.

The change is not death. The ruling tendency is not sup-

planted and destroyed by a foreign power. The change is not exchange or substitution; but it is evolution, development, progress. It is such change as is comprehended in the evolution of life. Amid continual changes, the same general type and law are perpetuated.

Different from the first rude leaves of the sprouting acorn, which soon wither and perish, the original trunk of the oak lives on, it may be, through several centuries, the identical individual existence it was in the beginning. Yet it is not the same trunk. It is not the same in the sense in which a piece of parchment, or a watch, may be precisely the same thing from year to year. What the trunk was, it is not now; what it is now, it will not be hereafter; what it is to be and will be, it is not and never has been. It changes not only as to size, shape, weight and external appearance, but also as to life and constitution. The life is more vigorous and more complete, and the constitution, if the process be normal, acquires qualities and aptitudes which it did not possess before, or the same qualities and aptitudes appear in different measure and form. So great and manifold is the change wrought in the course of a hundred years, that it exceeds the power of definite description. Yet this particular oak continues to be the same tree; the same as to genus and species; the same also as to individual existence. The last stage of evolution in the life of an oak, is only the full reality of what was potential in the germ of an acorn.

This is a natural mystery; the mystery of life. The understanding cannot analyze it. It confronts the eye of the reason. We gain an apprehension of it by the intuitive power of comprehension and insight; not by any inductive or deductive process.

It is in this genetic sense that history is progressive, and transcends itself continually. The ethical life of humanity, is reaching out and struggling after something which it is not; it is unceasingly becoming what it is not and never has been; and it will attain to a position scientifically, in regard to philosophy and theology; and will acquire a character ethically, which it does not and never did possess, which it never could possess

before, and cannot possess now. Opinions and theories, and methods of thought prevail for a season, perform their work, and fulfil their mission. In the degree in which they fulfil their mission, they originate or give occasion for the origination of modified forms of themselves; and as they occasion modifications of themselves, they exhaust their own vitality, lose their relative position and controlling influence, and resolve themselves into that form of general consciousness, and into that moral attitude of humanity, which comes after them and transcends them. In their original character, they cease to exist. Like leaves near the root, these opinions, theories, systems and forms of dogma, dry up and fall off. But having been a part of the general ethical process, they stand in an internal, living relation to the constitution of humanity; and in virtue of the law of development, they are taken up, transformed and converted into the flesh and blood of ethical life, as realized in the succeeding period of history. Thus, the self-evolving, general life of humanity, ever changing, yet always identical, moves forward towards a higher end, and in each succeeding age realizes a form of character which is new. And so the mysterious process will continue to go forward, ever advancing beyond itself from age to age, until all the possibilities of the beginning have passed into full reality.

This mysterious life-process in the sphere of the human spirit, is not purely human. It is not self-sufficient. It has not its ultimate ground in itself. Nor is it normal. It does not go forward in true accord with the original law of humanity, nor is the relative actualization, at any stage, answerable to the original idea.

History is the sum of three factors—the divine, the human and the diabolical; God, man, and the Devil. Of these three, two, the divine and the human, are original, essential and eternal. The diabolical is not original, but has supervened by a violent infraction upon the cosmical order, and the constitution of man. It is not essential, but accidental and abnormal. Nor is it eternal, but only temporary. History admitted this foreign force after it had been constituted; and history will also, in due time, surmount all the consequent disorder and confusion.

The divine factor in history is two-fold. On the one hand, it is the action of God in and upon mankind according to that original order of life as it held in Adam, the head of the race, before the fall. Man was the son of God, and like God. In all his powers and relations he was active in harmony with the will and being of God. He ruled in and over the world. He was its lord. Though now fallen and debased, yet his spirit retains a sense and a dream-like intuition of this primary filial relation. The Creator is present in creation, upholding and governing all things by the word of His Almighty power. Of this fact man has by nature an unerring instinct, and this instinct obtains authoritative expression in the conscience. Man feels and recognizes both the presence and power, and the direct action of God.

The divine factor in history, on the other hand, is the activity of God in and upon mankind according to the new and higher order of life as it holds in Jesus Christ, the incarnate Logos, the Head of a new created human race—a new order which in and through this new humanity reaches beyond the human and, apprehending nature, affects it in such sort that it is made to subserve the end of the incarnation.

The divine factor, though two-fold, is yet but one. The new creation in Christ is generically different from the first creation in Adam, yet as to their ground and ultimate purpose, they are the same. The law which informs the constitution and governs the life of the one, corresponds to the law which informs the constitution and governs the life of the other. The first creation demands the incoming of the second creation; and the second completes the idea and nature of the first. Though different in function and kind, yet nature and grace are hemispherical orders which together make one divine world; the direct action and governing power of God upon the lower, being subordinate to the end of the higher; and the special action of God through His Son by the Holy Ghost in the development and perfection of the higher, revealing and fulfilling the true intention of the lower. The final consummation of the Church

will be the full glory of the whole of God's creating and governing activity.

The divine is, the original and principal factor; we may also call it the determining factor of history. But the divine does not overwhelm the human, nor violate the freedom of the human. The activity of man is put forth according to his own nature and will.

The diabolical factor of history is present and active in the character of sin. Sin is the disturbing, divisive, disorganizing and disintegrating force, which like a deadly poison permeates the very blood of human life and circulates as a vitiating principle in all the arteries and veins of the soul, everywhere and always contravening all law and order, both human and divine.

The relation of sin to man is two-fold. Sin bears a relation to man as comprehended in the first creation; and it bears a relation to man as comprehended in the new creation in Christ. The temptation of the devil having prevailed, he became through the fall the god of man. Led captive at his will, the fallen world belongs to his kingdom, obeys his will, and worships him, either directly or indirectly. Sin is the governing power. Human freedom is no more than a vain show, in as much as, although the form of self-determining will still remains, the will is wanting altogether in the true substance of freedom. History is like a raving maniac. The human spirit, instinct with the sense of terrible contradiction between its nobler aspirations and the miseries of actual existence, writhes in agony, and struggles to free itself from violent bondage, but with each spasmodic effort falls back again helplessly under the augmented burden of sin. Yet athwart this deep gloom some broken rays from the true Light ever fall, inspiring the bond slaves of Satan with the faint hope of deliverance; and amid these awful perversions and horrors, the eye of Christian faith sees the wisdom and power of God so shaping and guiding the agony of the ages that the captive human spirit is gradually preparing for the dawn of the new creation.

The new creation is a victory over the devil and all the powers of darkness. Christ has led captivity captive. The devil

and sin now stand in a new subordinate relation to Christ and to His body, the Church. They still possess power, and produce all manner of evils in the world and in the bosom of the Church; for Christianity apprehends fallen human nature as it is, and takes it into the sphere of the new life with all its corrupt and sinful tendencies. Regenerated by the Spirit, men do indeed possess a new life, and their slavish subjection to sin is supplanted by true liberty; yet salvation is not perfect; they are not saved magically, but in accordance with the original law of their constitution; salvation is a *process* of deliverance. Hence though limited and restrained, Satan still continues to exercise power both in the world and upon the kingdom of Christ; and history, moulded and governed by Christianity, is in consequence more or less irregular, self-contradictory and abnormal. As the growth of the natural body is modified, checked or suspended by unfavorable climate and disease; so is the general ethical life of the world, in the effort to develop itself normally, limited, perverted, falsified, and sometimes temporarily suspended by the superhuman power of the devil.

These two classes of powers, on the one hand, the divine and human as being normal, essential, and harmonious, and on the other, the diabolical, as being abnormal, accidental and antagonistic, enter into the nature of history. The divine and human powers are in the proper sense factors, since they are each a necessary, plastic force, and a constituent element of the organic process of ethical development. The diabolical power being heterogeneous and having supervened in violation of the divine law and purpose of humanity, is in no sense an essential constituent of history; but as it has insinuated itself in the form of sin, into the very heart of mankind and corrupted its life-blood, it perverts the activity of the spirit, and thus exerts throughout all the ages of time a determining influence, from within, as it does also from without, upon the course and actual character of history.

These three powers: first, the presence and action of the divine in the world but particularly in the Church; secondly, the activity of the human in its relation to itself, and in its relation

to the two kingdoms, the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan; and thirdly, the positive antagonism to God and man of Satan in nature and in humanity; these three, each one according to its own order, are working in the life of the race, determining and conditioning the historical movement from the beginning to the end. The mysterious phenomena of history are the result of the interaction of these forces.

As history comprehends the entire activity of man, it is evident that it must be an element in every sphere in civilization and government, in religion, science, art and morality.

We will limit the further discussion of the subject to the relation which the historical element bears to theology.

Christian theology is the science of the heavenly cosmos, the new creation of God in Christ Jesus. The object of the science, that with which theology deals, is a divine constitution, and as such is neither determined nor affected by logical reflection. But the science itself, like philosophy in general and all the sciences, is human, not divine. It is the production of the human reason, which, moved by its own deepest needs seeks spontaneously to develop and articulate the contents of Christian faith according to the categories and laws of thought. Being science, a rational production, it is subject to the general conditions to which any other science is subject.

Theology has not been revealed. The scientific knowledge of God is not a part of revelation. God teaches no doctrinal system; neither in His Word nor anywhere else. Christ is not a professor of theology. The Scriptures do not contain science. We find in them no logical organization of thought. The different parts are internally connected, but not logically; they are connected according to the laws of organic evolution; and are therefore more nearly allied to the nature of a living constitution than to that of a logical system. The sacred Scriptures are not properly a concrete order. They are rather a true reflection of that concrete historical movement in which Christianity consists; and are handed down in the Church as the original and ultimate medium through which, if

we possess their spirit, we can investigate the objective truth, and construct a system of theological knowledge.

Theology is primarily knowledge, such knowledge as man, in the light and strength of faith, acquires by the exercise of his own mental faculties. It is not a quantum of information given to man by God, which he is to receive and keep, as a son may receive money from his father. In this way we do not acquire any kind of knowledge, much less the knowledge of God. But we get the knowledge of God just as we get all other knowledge, namely, by the application of our minds in the ordinary way to the study of the truth. For the knowledge of divine things differs from the knowledge of human things, not as regards form and method, but as regards the object and material. Hence whatever affects the activity of the mind, modifies thought and knowledge, and therefore also the knowledge of divine things, such as natural capacity, temperament, health, education, culture, the prevailing type of morality, social habits, government and climate. All these condition theology, as it obtains in an age in a community, or school, or in an individual.

It is not sufficient, however, to say that theology is knowledge. It is more than this. Theology is the scientific or systematic knowledge of divine things. System is the logical form of thought. Science includes system; but it is more than mere system. Science is the logical organization of the contents of an idea; or we may say that it develops and organizes the intuitive apprehension of objective truth. This involves the free activity and the most comprehensive activity of the human reason. Intuition, generic forms of thought, the spontaneous operation of the laws of thought, judgment, reflection and what is more important still, the will and the conscience, all interpenetrate each other organically in the process of rational activity which constructs scientific knowledge; and, consequently, these attributes of the human reason serve to give character of necessity to the state and progress of science.

But lying back of these particular functions of the reason, there is a determination that is deeper and broader. It is an

object of intuitive perception rather than of judgment and reflection; and is felt more easily than defined. This mystical background of science is the idea prevailing in the general mind, in regard to the general nature of things, their reciprocal relations and purpose, affecting particular departments of thought as the season of the year affects vegetation, the habits of animals, and the customs of society. This prevailing idea manifests itself in a general method of thinking, which suggests opinions, directs investigations and shapes theories; as also in a felt presence of a hidden standard of truth to which theories are instinctively referred, and by which moral conduct is adjudged right or wrong. Here in these deep recesses of humanity tendencies are conceived and born unseen, and nourished long before they come forth into the light of day. And here in this bosom of mysterious human powers is continually going forward the most virulent conflict between good and evil, truth and falsehood, Christ and the devil.

Now, whilst very much depends, as regards the state of theological science at any given time, on mental vigor, education, civilization, on the prevailing system of philosophy, and the progress of the sciences, much more depends on this current tendency and habit of mind, on the manner in which the age thinks, or any particular school or community thinks. For the prevailing tendency and method of thought imparts a common character, even to opposite systems of theology. If the predominant tendency be subjective and abstract, then opposite systems and different denominations will be alike in this, that they resolve Christianity into a peculiar religious state and activity of the human spirit, and are always predisposed to view a fact, an element, or a law, independently of the internal relation which it bears to the unity of which it is a necessary part. Whereas, if the prevailing method of thinking be objective and concrete, systems may differ as to Church polity, or the doctrine of the Sacraments, or the relation which objective authority bears to subjective freedom; but they will be alike in this, that however they may differ as respects particular dogmas, they regard Christianity, primarily, as a living constitution, more

real than the constitution of nature, and view facts, elements and laws, as necessary parts of the organic order to which they belong. So, too, if the general habit of mind be analytic, or synthetic, or genetic.

This general habit and tendency of thought, this underlying assumption, as regards the nature and relations of things, is the principal mediating power and condition of theological science. Genius, national culture, and the predominant system of philosophy, each one exercises an important modifying influence, but these are born of the age, and nourished at its bosom. To these, the prevailing general tendency of the age gives tone and coloring. Individual men are its organs, and particular theories its varying exponents. It is in and through them that the prevailing tendency mediates the character and progress of theology. Theology does not rise above it, and cannot. If the general habit be analytic and inductive, theology will endeavor to construct a system by analysis and induction. If the general habit be metaphysical and deductive, theology will move in the element of demonstration.

It cannot be otherwise, in the nature of the case. Knowledge and science are the product of human activity. No power outside of man can put knowledge, much less science, into him. God does not. God creates; He brings man into being, but in doing so He establishes a constitution that actualizes His idea, and embodies His will as inviolable law. The original, human constitution is the concrete decree of God. God may also regenerate. He creates anew in Christ by His spirit, and thus translates men into a heavenly world, setting them in new relations and endowing them with new powers. Standing in either order, it is the primary vocation of man to become self-conscious and self-active according to the law of his life. In the light of consciousness and by the activity of his own powers, he is to acquire knowledge and construct science. For this very purpose, that he may think and act for himself, was man made man, endowed with reason and will, and raised infinitely above the animal. Now, it is according to this law of his constitution, that God deals with him. To say that God may breathe into

him knowledge and science, and, superseding mental activity, may lift him out of the concrete relations of life, by an act of omnipotent power, is to say that God may annul His own idea and law, and thus contradict Himself.

If, then, man must acquire theological knowledge by his own personal act, by the proper exercise of reason and will, and if his rational activity is conditioned by the underlying, general tendency of the age, or the reactionary tendency in which he may stand, or by both, it follows that theology is conditioned not only by the peculiar characteristics of his mind, and the system of philosophy by which he is apprehended, but also by that deep and mighty tide of rational life which carries him upon its bosom. Theology appropriates and assimilates to itself these conditioning forces. They become an element in its character, and are an essential factor in the determination of its status at any given time.

Hence, theology rises and sinks, advances and recedes, diverges into false currents and returns to the main channel, with the general ethical movement of humanity. It sympathizes with the valid progress of history; also with all its contradictions, convulsions and conflicts. These modifications and changes, however, are not a wild, unmeaning and fitful play of disconnected and irresponsible powers, but they are comprehended in that continuous organic process, which belongs to the divine idea of human life. Over this process Christ rules, and in it He works towards a specific end; namely, the complete development of the objective truth in human consciousness, and the perfection of His body, the Church.

Of the nature of this organic process going on in the sphere of theological science, the past history of the Church affords a sufficient and forcible illustration; but time does not allow us to dwell on this aspect of the subject.

The historical element inheres in all science. Every department of scientific knowledge is continually changing and moving forward according to the law of life. But this element belongs to theology, and characterizes it in a pre-eminent sense; and for the reason that the objective truth which theology aims at

reproducing scientifically, is itself historical. Christianity is the most comprehensive and most perfect life-movement in the sphere of time. The Logos being its original ground, which accordingly stands above and beyond time, it begins in the promise concerning Himself, made to the mother of the race. The promise being thus coeval with human development, becomes the divine principle of a concrete, preparatory process, a preliminary constitution, which unfolds itself in successive stages, each one in turn transcending the measure of what goes before, yet at the same time bearing in itself, under a higher form, the mysterious intention of all preceding stages, until the fullness of time having come, this unique, symbolical constitution comes to maturity in the mystery of the incarnation, and then passes away, the purpose of its existence having been fulfilled in the personal presence of the Logos, the Son of the Virgin Mary.

The Logos was made flesh. He took human nature into life-union with Himself, not in appearance, nor magically, but really and truly; that is, in the act of becoming incarnate. He laid aside the transcendent form of divine existence, and began to exist in time and space, conformably to the law of organic development. From His miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost to His ascension, there is a regular unfolding of a divine-human life. One stage of life follows upon another naturally. So does one act of His redeeming work follow another naturally. And just as the natural process advances normally, does the fact of the incarnation authenticate itself as real, and reveal gradually more and more of its mysterious import and purpose.

Objectively considered, this is Christianity, this organic process developing the fullness of divine-human life under all the conditions of time and space, whereby human nature in Christ is united to God, by the new creating power of the Holy Ghost, and so regenerated and delivered from all the power of the Devil.

But this organic process has not yet reached its final stage, and assumed its ultimate form. Christianity is incomplete, as really, though in a different degree, as when Christ was a babe.

We believe not only in Christ conceived and born, crucified, risen and ascended; we believe also in Christ coming to judge the quick and the dead; we believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting. These are future facts, and just as essential to the integrity and proper character of Christianity, as the death of Christ on the cross. Manhood abolishes boyhood: so does the flower abolish the bud, and the fruit, the flower. In like manner, does Christianity, being a living constitution, undergo organic changes. The last stage, when developed, will abolish preceding forms of existence; not destroy them, but fulfil them; just as ripe fruit transcends, abolishes and, at the same time, fulfils the bud. Fruit actualizes the idea and purpose of all that goes before. So will the final consummation, in the second Advent of Christ, reveal to faith the full import of the entire process of His divine-human life in time.

Christianity, coeval with the birth of time, unfolding itself in two dispensations and throughout all the ages, and going beyond the time-order of things, is therefore an organic process, which realizes the nature and law of history in a sense and degree that in no other form confronts the human reason.

Answerable to this objective historical order, of which Christ is the principle and the consummation, is the subjective development of faith and knowledge in the consciousness of prophets and Apostles. Simple faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah, without any right conception of His person, grew gradually in the minds of the disciples into the perception of a supernatural presence, until Peter, speaking in the name of the Twelve, gave utterance to a higher apprehension in that wonderful primal confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." But this true confession co-existed with erroneous views and great ignorance of the nature of His work. Though clearly foretold by Christ Himself, yet the disciples were incapable even of entertaining the idea of His propitiatory death and triumphant resurrection. So foreign was the necessity of His crucifixion and resurrection to all their views and expectations, that His condemnation by Pilate and execution as a

malefactor, filled them with despair; and the first report of His resurrection seemed like an idle tale. Not until they had received the Pentecostal baptism of the Holy Ghost, did these select scholars of Christ emerge into the light of day. Yet even then, though inspired miraculously, their knowledge of the kingdom was at first imperfect and defective, and their judgment crude. A miraculous vision was necessary in order to prevail on Peter, this bold, confessing representative of the Apostolic College, to preach the Gospel to Cornelius and other Gentiles. So deep-rooted were his narrow Jewish prejudices. And for obeying the heavenly vision, it was necessary to vindicate his conduct at length, in order not to fall under the condemnation of his peers. Thus, only by a gradual process, moving in a natural way and extending through many years, did these men, enjoying the highest degree of inspiration, transcend their narrow conceptions and false notions, and finally come to a distinct and full apprehension of the truth.

The same general feature characterizes Holy Scripture. The first three Gospels, by general acknowledgment, move on a lower plane than the Gospel of St. John, which was written last and by that one of the disciples who stood at the Cross. If we study the Epistles of St. Paul in the order of time in which they were written, we can scarcely fail to observe the natural process of growth in the mind of the Apostle, under tuition of the Spirit, in the knowledge of the Person of Christ and His kingdom. The Book of Revelation, written last, deals with the last things. Writing in his old age, the surviving Apostle, after administering final instructions and counsels to the churches in Asia Minor, looks beyond the present time; and, his eagle eye penetrating the vista of the future, he portrays in symbolic imagery the conflicts, the triumphs and the full ultimate glory of the one Holy Catholic Church. The last book, written by the last Apostle, rises thus above all previous apprehension, and reveals the final consummation of the mysterious historical movement of the supernatural under the law of the natural, which begins with the beginning of time, and, unfolding itself organically through all the ages, closes the whole process by resolving it into the transcendent order of glorified life.

Here, then, we have in objective Christianity a living process which is the most sublime and the most perfect historical movement; we have a corresponding process in the growing faith and consciousness of inspired Apostles and Evangelists; and we have in the organic constitution of the sacred canon, a definite reflection of both sides of the historical development. Confronted by this new and wonderful order of divine-human life in the form of history, the human reason, in the unceasing effort to evolve scientifically the contents of faith, stands continually under an objective moulding influence, that gives impulse to, energises and sustains, a corresponding organic process in the sphere of logical thought, which in the highest possible degree realizes the historical element. The organic law of mind; the spontaneous tendency of human thinking continually to transcend itself and reach forward to what lies beyond, finds its fullest scope in theological science. The movement will go forward necessarily in time to come, until Christianity itself becomes complete, when theological science will bear its ripest fruit.

The historical element in theology is related on the one hand to Creed, and on the other to Confessions. The limits of a discourse, however, confine this discussion to a general view of the subject, and forbid us to enter into an examination of the particular questions which it involves.

We conclude with a brief statement of a few inferences which follow from the whole subject.

No particular status of theological science can be fixed and permanent. Theology may pass through a period of earnest, vigorous thought, and attain to results which are an advance upon the whole previous consciousness of the Church, and may be a relative completion of the science as it stood before, yet this position of theology is not unchangeable because it is such an advance and relative completion. Just the reverse. An advanced status of theology is the product of living thought, and it is true and valuable only as long as it stands in connection with living thought. So soon as living thought ceases, or exhausts itself, or dies, theological ideas must die too. When

a tree dies, the fruit must wither, and the leaves fall off. Then the theological status becomes a dead form of knowledge, and loses all power to nourish mind and thought. But if living thought continues to be living, it is also productive. Any given result carries in itself the necessity of further development. It is like a flower that must die or pass over into fruit; or like fruit that embosoms the seed which carries in itself the power, type and law of a new growth. If the embosomed seed does not become productive, it is for one of two reasons; either the seed has no life, or the living seed is not surrounded with the proper conditions. So in regard to the progress of theology. The legitimate product of any age of vigorous thought, is itself productive. If not productive, either it is dead and therefore worthless, or there is no fertility in the mind of the Church, sufficient to carry forward the productive process. But if the ideas be legitimate and the doctrines be true, they possess living force, and therefore do work and must work organically in the thinking of the Church. Hence a true doctrinal position, in as far as it is true, is a power that works, according to historical law, towards a result that lies beyond itself, and in which it finds a higher relative completeness. No particular doctrinal position can therefore, in the nature of the case, be a fixed position, which is to stand as the ultimatum of truth for all subsequent ages.

We do not wish to be understood, however, as implying that the objective truth itself undergoes changes, excepting such organic changes as are determined by the law of its own divine-human constitution. What Christianity is in itself as the new creation in Christ Jesus, it is independently of human judgment and human will. It unfolds itself and moves, through successive stages, towards ultimate consummation according to the law of its own life. This new creation is the object of faith, and in itself is unaffected by the progress of theology. But dogmas are not divine; they are human. Dogma is the definite form of apprehension by the regenerated human reason, of the objective facts of Christianity. Dogma is therefore mediated by thought, and though conditioned by the presence and overruling

power of Christ by the Spirit, it must undergo modifications answerable to the general historical movement of human life.

From what has now been said it follows, also, that *the doctrinal position of any past age, cannot be made by itself the standard of sound doctrine for all future time, by a deliberate purpose of the Church.* The Church of the Reformation, whether Reformed or Lutheran, cannot repristinate the precise form of faith and worship that prevailed in the sixteenth century. Nor can the Church of England repristinate the peculiar type of Christian life which prevailed in the age preceding the rise of the Roman Catholic Papacy. The deliberate purpose is itself a change, a new position. The Reformation, for instance, did not refer itself to itself, and affirm, or imply, that its doctrinal position and cultus were the final rule and measure of truth to the end of coming ages. On the contrary, the faith of the Reformation rooted itself, in the way of most solemn Confession, in the Apostle's Creed, the faith of the Church Catholic through all past time; and the theological system of that period did not claim to be a new and independent creation but sustained itself by reference to the better results of theological thought as these appear in every period of history back to the Apostolic period; and by the aid of this whole process of thought it studied Holy Scripture. Now, to ignore or set aside the historical connection of the faith and theology of the Reformation with preceding ages, and make the precise theological expression of faith of that time the law of inquiry and living thought, and the limit of theological knowledge, is not only arbitrary and mechanical, but is also, in spite of the effort to establish a given position permanently, a radical change of position, perverting and contradicting the theological status which we profess to honor. For the theology of the Reformation claimed to be no more than a purer and fuller development, and a better articulation of the revealed truth taught and believed in all previous periods of Church history.

We may add also that the past is in a certain sense buried. It may be buried by violence or in a legitimate way. The past can be revived, but it cannot be exhumed. To exhume the

past, ignoring the intervening thinking and progress of the Church, is to bring up a corpse. But to revive the buried past is to quicken anew its own proper life, and unfold it freely, and according to the present demands of faith and thought.

The Heidelberg Catechism was buried during the last century by the violence of rationalism and infidelity. The present theological movement of the Church, has restored this noble symbol of the Reformed faith to authority and honor. But it has not restored to honor a dead thing; but breathed into it afresh the breath of a vigorous life. The Christocentric faith and organic thought of the Catechism, has been developed and is in process of being wrought out conformably to the original posture and reigning spirit of the Catechism.

The present position which the Reformed Church in America has come to occupy historically, is the very position which distinguishes the Heidelberg Catechism. By its very structure it connects itself internally with the universal faith of the Church. The Apostle's Creed is the law, the internal formative force, which negatively and positively determines the organization of its parts, and governs the expression of doctrine. Thus it connects itself directly with every previous age of the Church, and honors the authority of every previous age.

On the other hand, in modifying the doctrinal expression of faith, it claims the right to think for itself—the right to make due account of history. It acknowledges and emphasizes the historical element in theological science. The Catechism claims to be a progressive movement. It claims and exercises the right to work out such changes in doctrine as are a true and legitimate unfolding of the unchangeable faith.

This general position of the Catechism is the general position which the Reformed Church of the present day is earnestly seeking to occupy. The Church receives the confessional system of the Heidelberg Catechism as being in harmony with the Bible; and owns its doctrines as flowing from the Bible in the sense of the Creed. But the Church does not convert the Catechism into a Procrustean bed, and forbid theological thinking and theological teaching to transcend these iron limits.

Whilst the Catechism is true and possesses binding authority for faith and teaching, it is not held to be in all its particulars the final perfection of theology. The Church feels itself to be free as well as bound—free to think, as well as bound to believe—free to think historically, as well as bound to submit in child-like simplicity to the faith of the Church as held in all ages of the world.

ARTICLE VI.—ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

THE title it bears does not mean that the symbol, as we now have it, was the work originally of the Apostles themselves. It has been indeed a very widely prevalent opinion in the Church, resting in long tradition, that it originated in this way. Rufinus, a church father of the fourth century, speaks of it as a common belief in that age, handed down from earlier times, that the Apostles, before separating to their different fields of labor, met together in Jerusalem, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost framed and adopted this compend, to be received by the infant churches everywhere as a common bond of faith. The term *symbol* was supposed to favor, as it probably at first suggested, this imagination, by indicating in its Greek etymology a joint composition made up of different parts contributed from different quarters; in conformity with which view then it was sometimes held also, that each Apostle had contributed separately a distinct article or clause to the work which was thus brought to pass. But this whole opinion is easily shown to be false. No such Apostolic rule is spoken of in the New Testament. None of the church fathers before Rufinus, Greek or Latin, make any mention of the tradition to which he refers; and in all their controversies and discus-

sions, we meet with no appeal whatever to any such single fixed form of words, as of established authority from the time of the Apostles. On the contrary, the way in which they express themselves in regard to the subject, shows clearly that no fixed form of this sort was in existence. They refer frequently to a Christian rule or canon of faith, and occasionally give us the sum of its contents; but this always with such free variation, as plainly implies that the rule was regarded as standing in the substance of what it taught, rather than in any particular form of expression. Nay, the testimony of Rufinus himself is conclusive in regard to this point. He affirms expressly, that the form was not the same precisely in all the churches; additions were made to it in some cases, in opposition to particular new phases of heresy. What the title of the symbol means then is, not that it was composed by the Apostles, but that it contains, in a form universally approved by the Church, the sum and substance of what the Apostles taught, the fundamental rule and normative scheme of the Christian faith, as this had been established by them and handed down from the beginning.

The conception of such a normative scheme does not require continued sameness of words for its representation, but only sameness of substance and fact. Even the tradition mentioned by Rufinus, which in the fourth century referred the authorship of the creed to the Apostles, must be taken to have understood this more of its substantive matter than of the precise form of words in which it was uttered. For Rufinus does not pretend to restrict this honor to any one form of the general creed then in use; but takes it for granted rather, that all the churches enjoyed in this respect the same advantage, as being alike in possession of the faith received from the Apostles. No difficulty was felt among the churches in recognizing the identity of their faith, through all the variations that were allowed in the form of its expression. It was known, that the general symbol admitted an utterance more or less free, as circumstances might require; that particular clauses had been brought into it with the progress of time, which did not belong

to it in the beginning ; and that it was not the same precisely at all points, in any two leading provinces of the Church. And yet it was felt none the less surely for all this, that the Church had but one creed, and that this was of truly Apostolical origin and force. Its unity stood in its substance. Its stability was not in the outward letter, so much as in the inward spirit. It was written and preserved, as Jerome tells us, not on parchment, but on the fleshy tables of the heart.

We may easily see in this way, how the symbol, as we now have it, may be said to refer itself back, through all its early changes and variations, to the very age of the Apostles, and to carry in itself as derived immediately from them what was the one unvarying faith of the Church in following ages. It lies in the nature of the case, that the Christian profession must have involved some common rule of faith from the beginning ; and we know from the New Testament, that this stood in the acknowledgment of the mystery of the Incarnation, the coming of Christ in the flesh. Christianity roots itself, both as doctrine and life, in that fact. Peter's memorable confession (Matt. xvi. 16. John vi. 68, 69), becomes thus the germ or principle of all right confessional belief : carrying in itself, we may say, the universal truth and power of the Gospel. The form of baptism, as prescribed by our Saviour Himself, is only an enlarged utterance of the same faith. The Holy Trinity is revealed only in and through Christ ; to confess Him, is to confess at the same time the Father and the Holy Ghost ; and this threefold confession gives us at once the outline and scheme of the entire creed. How far it may have become usual, before the death of the Apostles, to take into the scheme formally, the secondary clauses of the confession as it now stands, cannot be clearly determined. But no one familiar with the early history of Christianity can well fail to see, that this must have been done at least to some considerable extent ; and there is good reason to believe, that early in the second century, if not before, nearly all the particulars now embraced in it were found more or less in current use.

Still, as already said, this current use remained irregular

and free. There was one creed, but various forms of giving it utterance. These variations were not felt to trench at all upon the unity of the general tradition or rule; and this is frequently appealed to accordingly, by the early writers, as being of acknowledged and easily intelligible authority. Irenæus speaks of such an "immovable rule of faith," and describes it as proclaiming the same particulars that are found in the later creeds; and he makes it to be, at the same time, of Apostolical and universal authority; a tradition handed down from the Apostles and their disciples, which was kept sacredly by the Church diffused throughout the whole world. "The dialects in which it is uttered," he says, "are different; but the tradition is in force the same. The churches founded in Germany have no other faith and doctrine; nor those in Spain; nor those among the Celts; nor those in the East; nor those in Egypt; nor those in Lybia; nor those of more central situation; but as the sun, God's workmanship, is over the whole globe one and the same, so also the evangelical truth shines everywhere and illuminates all who are willing to come to its light." Tertullian appeals frequently in the same free way, to the Christian rule of faith, and recapitulates several times its general contents, always in harmony with the sum of it as given by Irenæus, for the purpose of confuting and confounding the heretics of his own time. His recapitulations are indeed always different, sometimes more and sometimes less full, showing that the creed was life more than mere word; but they assume throughout, nevertheless, the clear identity belonging to it as a single apostolical tradition. "*Regula fidei*," he tells us, "*uno omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis.*" The amount of it is always: One God, the Almighty Maker of the world; His Son, Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, constituted Messiah, crucified under Pontius Pilate, raised the third day, exalted to heaven, and set at the right hand of God, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; the Holy Ghost sent forth vicariously, according to His promise, to sanctify those that believe in his name; the resurrection of the flesh, the damnation of the wicked, and the recep-

tion of the righteous into eternal life and the blessedness of heaven. This rule, he says, instituted by Christ, allows no questions, other than such as spring from heresy and go to make heretics; it is older than all heresies; their novelty, as exposed by it, serves to establish its antiquity; to know nothing beyond it, is to know all that is necessary. Origen, in like manner gives a summary statement of the heads of Christian doctrine, "as plainly received by apostolical tradition," which corresponds in substance with the same rule. From Cyprian again we learn, that the whole creed, nearly as we have it now was made use of in Africa, in his time, as a rule of faith derived from the Apostles, in connection with the service of baptism. These private testimonies show the presence everywhere in the early Church of an evangelical tradition, agreeing in its general contents with the creed as it now stands, and accepted as of strictly apostolic origin and weight. They show also, that this tradition, though always of the same general type, was not regarded as a slavish form of words, but as a free doctrine rather which might be uttered in various ways. Cyprian gives us a glimpse into the general African formula, as it was everywhere of force in the first part of the third century. Other sections of the Church had similar standing forms; some more full perhaps than others; those of the East different from those of the West; but all handed down from the earliest time, and palpably expressing one and the same faith, as they belonged also to one and the same baptism. In the fourth century, these public formularies come more distinctly into view; and now it was that a sort of central dignity and preëminence, among the symbols of the Western Church, began to be claimed and allowed in favor of the form which had long been in use at Rome. Gradually this authority became more and more widely established; other local and provincial forms fell quietly into neglect; until finally the Roman symbol, in the fifth and sixth centuries, worked its way into universal use; and has thus come down to us, with the veneration of the whole Christian world, as the standard version or edition of the ancient rule of faith, the best and truest

representation of the fundamental realities of the Christian religion, the proper "Apostles' Creed."

Thus it is that this form of sound words lies at the foundation of Christianity in all centuries and through all times. No confessionalism can be truly Christian, which does not start from this confession as its original root and source. Here, as on a common basis, all Churches rest, whether Oriental or Western, Roman Catholic or Protestant. The object of the Reformation was to remove the rubbish which threatened to smother the life of the ancient faith, not by any means to set aside this faith itself. Both divisions of the Protestant Church, accordingly, the Lutheran and the Reformed, joined in acknowledging the ancient œcumenical symbols, and especially the root of all symbols as found in the Apostles' Creed. In the Lutheran Church, the three primary Creeds (Apostolical, Nicene and Athanasian) are made to precede the Augsburg Confession, in the Form of Concord; to show, says Walch, "that Lutherans embrace not a new doctrine, but such as is old and apostolical, and profess thus the truly catholic faith." The Reformed Church here was of one mind with the Lutheran. Thus in Calvin's Catechism the first section treats of *Faith*; which is said to have the sum of its contents in the "formula of confession held in common by all Christians, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, and always received from the beginning among the pious, as being either derived from the mouth of the Apostles or faithfully collected from their writings." So in the Heidelberg Catechism the "articles of our catholic, undoubted Christian faith," as comprised in the same symbol, are made to underlie the whole doctrine of salvation. The Gallican, Belgic, and Helvetic Confessions, as well as the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, distinctly acknowledge the three Creeds, Apostolic, Nicene and Athanasian, as of universal obligation for the faith of Christians.

With the outward history of the Apostles' Creed corresponds in full its inward constitution. It agrees throughout with the actual objective movement of the Christian salvation, and represents the form it must necessarily have, as apprehend-

ed by faith, for the Christian consciousness. It is not the product of reflection, employed with the doctrinal statements of the Bible; it is drawn rather from the direct contemplation of Christ, the living principle of the Gospel, and is the first utterance of what the faith of the Church saw in Him from the beginning, as being the brightness of the Father's glory and the revelation of all grace and truth for the world. Apprehended in this manner, Christ and Christianity were no doctrine simply, no theory for the understanding, but a grand act or drama of the most real kind, by which God was seen entering the world through the mystery of the Incarnation, and carrying out the work of man's redemption in an objective, historical way, reaching through all time. Thus objective and real, the Christian salvation necessarily determined its own form; and this then determined necessarily also the form of its believing apprehension in the mind of the Church. The fundamental consciousness of the Church here must be in harmony with its object, the fundamental movement of Christianity itself; otherwise it would be no faith at all, but fancy only or opinion. The early creeds then which were in truth as we have seen but one creed (authentically fixed for general use at last in what we now call the Apostles' Creed), as the expression of this consciousness, could have only one general order and shape, answerable to what was thus apprehended as real in the Christian mystery itself. The organization of the Creed, in this view, is not a matter of indifference; as though it were the result of accident or mere subjective schematization; it is ruled by the actual movement of its object, the historical manifestation of the Holy Trinity in Christ, and the historical consequences of his Incarnation in his own Person and in the Church, on to the resurrection of the dead and the life everlasting. The form of the symbol thus is just as necessary as its matter. Christianity fundamentally is this array of facts, and this order of facts, and no other. In the creed we have not only the primordial constituents of the Christian faith, but the only construction of them also which can be regarded as true. Those who dream of other possible better summaries

of the "first principles" of Christianity, either in the way of different matter or in the way of different form, only show that they have not entered properly into the sense of the Creed, and that faith for them is not the same thing it was held to be in the early Church. As there is but one Christianity (one historical movement of the Mystery of Godliness) objectively, so there can be but one true way of apprehending it by faith; and that way we have presented to us in the Apostles' Creed.

It lies in the very conception of the symbol as now given, that it moves throughout in the sphere of faith. So much is signified at once by its name. It has to do from beginning to end with things, which are real and true only in the supernatural order of life that has been introduced into the world by Jesus Christ. All its articles are mysteries; not to be certified or measured by the natural understanding of men; not to be settled in the first place by empirical observation or logical proof; but authenticating themselves rather to the Christian consciousness in an *a priori* way, as necessary deductions from the primary fact of Christianity, the actual coming of Christ in the flesh. The assumption is, in this view, that they may be believed, nay *must* be believed if Christ is true, even where there is no power to understand or explain fully what they mean. To believe in Christ necessarily involves the belief of all that His advent is represented as drawing after it in the Creed; the consciousness of the Church, exercised with the problem of what it felt itself to possess in His Person, found itself shut up from the beginning, we may say, to each successive point, as the necessary expression of what was comprehended in its faith, over against all surrounding infidelity and heresy. And so still; we cannot break off the onward flow of this confession at any one point, so as to hold a portion of it only without regard to what comes after. All its parts are organically bound together. They represent the movement of one and the same fact. We must believe all or nothing.

We have a right to say thus, that the Apostles' Creed is the deepest, and for that reason the most comprehensive also of all Christian symbols or confessions of faith. It lies at the foun-

dation of all evangelical unity, and forms in this way the last basis and bond of common comprehension in the general conception of the Church. No religious community refusing to stand on this basis, no religious teacher pretending to construct Christianity on any other foundation, can have any right to claim footing in the Gospel, or fellowship with the Apostles.

Works on the subject: *King* (Lord), History of the Apostles' Creed, with Critical Observations, 5 edit. London, 1738, (translated into Latin by *Olearius*); *J. D. Vossius*, De Tribus Symbolis Dissert. Amstel. 1701, fol.; *H. Witsius*, Dissertation on what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, translated from the Latin by *D. Fraser*; *Pearson* (Bishop), On the Creed; *Möhler*, Einheit der Kirche, oder Princip des Katholicismus im Geiste der Kirchenväter der ersten 3 Jahrhunderte, Tüb., 1825; *Rudelbach*, die Bedeutung des Apostolischen Symbolums, 1844; *J. Stockmeier*, über Entstehung des Apostolischen Symbolums, 1846; *Meyers*, De Symbol. Apostol. Treviris, 1849; *W. W. Harvey*, History and Theology of the Three Creeds, 2 vols., 1855.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

It is known to the readers of this REVIEW that this commentary of the Old and New Testaments is appearing in English, under the supervision of Dr. Schaff. The volumes thus far issued have attained a popularity beyond that of any other commentary that has ever been published in this country.

We have received the last two volumes thus far issued, which have been already favorably noticed by the religious press generally. The first is a commentary on the book of Genesis, by Dr. Lange himself, translated, with valuable additions, by Prof. Taylor Lewis, LL.D., and A. Gosman, D.D.; the second volume contains commentaries on the epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews, by C. A. Auberlen, and C. J. Riggenbach, I. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., and Carl Bernhard Moll, translated by John Lillie, D.D., E. A. Washburn, D.D., E. Harswood, D.D., Horatio B. Hackett, D.D., and A. C. Kendrick, D.D.

The first of these volumes contains a complete Theological and Homiletical Introduction to the Old Testament, besides a special Introduction to the book of Genesis. Special interest attaches to this volume, on account of the position it occupies as the first book of the Bible, and the attacks that have recently been made upon it and the whole Pentateuch, by Bishop Colenso, and others of similar skeptical tendencies. It may be specially commended also to those, who have become more or less familiar with Lange's theological system. It is known, that he was regarded with special favor as a theologian by the lamented Dr. H. Harbaugh. His favorite views on ideal Christology serve to bring out in more than usual prominence the idea of the eternal God-man as involved in the first creation. For instance, in his Doctrinal and Ethical remarks on the first chapter of Genesis: "Here comes especially into consideration the relation of the doctrine of the creation to the Logos, John i. 1-3. The first verse of Genesis clearly forms the ground presupposed in that passage, God spake; through his word he created the world, says Genesis; his word is a personal divine life, says John and the New Testament in general, especially Col. i. 15-19; ch. ii. 3-9. According to Genesis everything is created through the idea of man in the image of God, with a view to this man; according to the New Testament it is through the idea of Christ, who is the principle of humanity, with a view to Christ. As Adam was the principal of the creation, so is Christ the principal of humanity. Therefore it reads: 'God hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world' (Eph. i. 4; comp. John xvii. 5). The creation is, in its most essential point, the production of the eternal God-man in the eternal to-day. In man nature has passed beyond itself, from the relative, symbolical independence, to the perfected and real, to freedom; it has in him the mediator of its redemption, of its glorification. The beautiful cosmos, this unity of all varieties, which combines in it an endless complex of unities, to the production of external harmony and beauty, has, in Christ, the most beautiful of the children of men, its middle point, the centre of its ideal beauty. Finally, the first æon, which is fixed by the life of Adam, has for its core, its root, and its aim, the second æon fixed by Christ."

The work of translating could not have fallen into better hands than Prof. Taylor Lewis, whose acknowledged reputation as a thorough biblical scholar and theologian will be sufficient to ensure to all, the ability and faithfulness with which he has done his work.

We trust that these volumes will soon find their way, if they have not done so already, into the libraries of our ministers, and also of others. No family can fail to be profited by having so valuable an assistance in reading the Holy Scriptures. They are published by

Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGE; WITH STUDIES IN ST. AUGUSTINE ON KINDRED TOPICS, by the Rev. Augustine F. Hewitt, of the Congregation of St. Paul. New York: The Catholic Publication House, 126 Nassau Street, 1868.

The special problems discussed in this handsome volume of over 400 pages, as we are told in the preface, relate to the harmony and analogy between natural or rational theology and certain doctrines of revealed or supernatural theology. Some idea of the topics discussed may be gained by its table of contents: Chapter I, Introductory; II, Relation of the Credible Object to the Creditive Subject; III, The Being of God, the first article of the Creed; IV, The Revelation of the Supernatural Order, and its relation to the primitive idea of Reason; V, The Trinity of Persons included in the one Divine Essence; VI, The dogma of Creation—The Principle, Archetype, and End of the Creative Act; VII, The End of Creation metaphysically final, &c., &c.; VIII, A further explanation of the Supernatural Order; IX, The State of Probation, &c.; X, The Original State of the First Parents of Mankind, &c.; XI, The Mystery of Redemption; XII, The Catholic Church, &c.; XIII, The Final destruction of Angels and Men, &c. It will thus be seen, that the topics discussed are taken up in the order of the Apostles' Creed. They are treated, of course, from the Roman Catholic standpoint. The special object had in view is to show, that revealed religion, though above, is not contrary to reason. It is but just to say, that the discussions are of the most able character, far above much of the theological writing of our day. The author shows himself to be an accomplished scholar, abundantly at home in the region of Philosophy, or pure thinking.

He starts with the consciousness of God, which is the basis in man for the development of his religious nature. This consciousness, in order to attain to a correct knowledge of God, must be met by a revelation, or rather is thus met by an authority which asserts itself as divine, being that of God Himself. To reject this authority is unreasonable. The author here falls into the error, into which some Protestant theologians also fall, viz., that revealed religion comes with such reasonable demonstration as to compel the assent of the reason. True, he states that his object is not to beget faith by a process of reasoning; this cannot be done. He would only remove those difficulties which lie in the outer vestibule. Still we think sufficient account is not made, even here, of the moral side of man's nature. Reason, or philosophy, evidently has a work to perform in combating the objections to Christianity urged in the sphere of reason. It can be proved that only the fool denies that there is a God. Philosophy also serves a good purpose in the case of a believer, in showing him that his faith does not contradict reason.

But the strongest appeal, after all, must be made to man's moral nature. This was the appeal our Saviour made. There must be a certain moral status or attitude in man, which, by the aid of divine grace, responds to the revelation when made. Where men, by their own act, vitiate this moral status, the truth will be rejected, and no amount of reasoning can lead them to accept it. The Roman Catholic presents authority, the Protestant often presents what he calls evidences, but both fall short of leading men in unbelief to assent to the truth.

We find the treatment of the atonement quite as unsatisfactory as the theories which are discarded. On the subject of the fall, and original sin, the view is the semi-pelagian view of the Roman Church. Much that is beautiful is presented on the subject of the Incarnation.

Every one must admire the earnestness and untiring industry of the Paulist Fathers, under whose auspices Catholic publications are issued and scattered broadcast, thick as the autumn leaves. They seem determined to outdo even Protestants. They adapt themselves to the American public, and seem especially to be addressing themselves to Protestants. They have already secured a listening and attentive audience in New England, as may be seen from the favorable notice given them in the *Atlantic Monthly*. We shall not be at all surprised, if New England takes lovingly to this opposite extreme, and becomes Roman Catholic. The way to meet Romanism successfully is to avoid the Rationalism into which Puritanism has so largely fallen.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF QUINTUS SEPT, FLOR. TERTULLIANUS AGAINST MARCION, translated by Peter Holmes, D. D., F. R. A. S., Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honorable the Countess of Rothes. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street; London, Hamilton & Co.; Dublin, John Robertson & Co.

THE WRITINGS OF CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE, Translated by Rev. Robert Ernest Wallis, Ph. D., Senior Priest of Wells Cathedral, and Incumbent of Christ Church, Coxley, Somerset. Vol. 1, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark & Co.

The above are volumes VII. and VIII. of the Ante-Nicene Library, containing translations of the Fathers down to A. D. 325, edited by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, D. D., and James Donaldson, LL. D. The enterprise of translating into the English tongue, and publishing such an edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers is worthy of all commendation and encouragement. We have no doubt that the volumes, as they are now issued, and also, in time to come, will find a ready sale. In all directions there is a revival of interest in the literature of the early Church. Protestantism is coming to feel itself called more than ever to claim and maintain its patrimony in that period of Church History. Its very existence as a continuation historically of the one Holy Catholic Church requires this. The separate principles of the Reformation must find their proper position as involved in the broader principle of Christianity. The principle of Protestantism is not itself the principle of Christianity, but only one of the processes through which this latter develops itself in the onward movement of the Church. Hence, as Protestants we cannot start with the Reformation, but must find the beginning of our Protestant Church-life, where the whole Church finds its beginning. This leads to the desire to study the history of the early Church, and these volumes will serve to satisfy this want on the part of many, who have not access to

the writings of the Fathers in the original. Even for the professional student, to whom for critical uses they can be of no service, they will be acceptable; but most of all to those ministers and certain laymen, who have neither the time nor preparation to study them in their original language, will this translation be a gracious help. We commend this library to our ministers generally, especially in view of the moderate expense incurred in procuring it as it is issued from time to time. They can be had of SMITH, ENGLISH & Co., No. 23 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, Tracing the Train of Thought by the aid of Parallelism, with Notes and Dissertation on the Principal Difficulties connected with the exposition of the Epistle, by John Forbes, LL. D., Edinburgh. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1868.

There is no doubt but that the author gets hold of the key to the proper meaning of this Epistle, in the use of his favorite principle of parallelism. The parallel, especially between Adam and Christ, is taken as the key note. The result of his investigation leads him to repudiate the mechanical theory of imputation, as advocated by Dr. Hodge, against whose views on this subject the notes are made principally to bear. We think he is not entirely consistent throughout with his own theory, but he is clearly in advance of, and nearer to the truth than the common Presbyterian theory on the subject of imputation.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH, AND THAT OF THE LAMENTATIONS, Translated from the original Hebrew, with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical, by E. Henderson, D. D. Andover: Warren F. Draper; Boston: W. H. Halliday & Co., No. 58 and 60 Cornhill; Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1868.

This Commentary consists of a translation of the original text together with critical Philological and Exegetical notes.

In general the work is marked by a pleasing absence of attempts at the new and conjectural. Old and cherished opinions are in no case given up, and the author does not think too highly of the wonders of criticism. The book is unambitious. The results are mostly reliable, but the means by which they are attained are not satisfactorily given. The author does not discuss the disputed points at all, which is indeed in many cases to be praised, when for instance the point is raised on capricious or weakly sustained critical grounds. But, for instance in reference to the fiftieth chapter, we would desire to see the question sifted by the author rather than referred to a work inaccessible to nearly all for whom the author wrote.

On the other hand, we miss a doctrinal discussion of many points. True, the author does not pretend to give doctrinal notes, but why did he not to a suitable degree? Thus with regard to fiftieth chapter, ver.

5. A closer treatment of the doctrinal side of this verse would be acceptable, especially as, from the days of Origen down to this day, it has been looked upon as teaching, not only a fore-ordination on the part of God, but of a *pre-existence* of the soul.

The author has followed the division into chapters. We think it a pity, that he did not cut loose from them, and divide strictly as a critical division demands.

The remarks at the heads of the chapters are perspicuous and instructive. The notes usually give a fixed definite result, and are not too copious. The author's feelings seem scarcely to influence his representations. He is calm and cool—too much so for Jeremiah.

The work is a good explanation of Jeremiah, but furnishes but little of that which most ministers think they need.

The translation is excellent, and throws light on whole passages. It is relatively the best part of the whole book. K.

MORAL USES OF DARK THINGS, by Horace Bushnell. New York, Charles Scribner & Co., 1868.

This volume of about 350 pages is made up of a series of articles published in the *Hours at Home*. We read some of them with much interest while they were appearing in that Magazine, and we have read them over again in this volume with increased interest and pleasure. Dr. Bushnell is too well known to the readers of this Review to need any commendation from us as a solid thinker, and a clear, vigorous writer. He is clearly one of the leading minds of this country. His works on *Nature and the Supernatural*, *Vicarious Sacrifice*, *Christian Nurture*, &c., fairly entitle him to be ranked among the first thinkers and theologians of our times.

The Essays before us are not formally woven into a treatise, and yet it is plain, in reading them, that they are most intimately related to each other. Dr. Bushnell has uttered some profound thoughts in regard to the relation of sin to God. He grapples here with a side of creation, which calls up the same line of thought. *Physical Pain*, *Winter*, *Things Unsightly and Disgustful*, *Plague and Pestilence*, *Insanity*, *Non-Intercourse between Worlds*, *Night and Sleep*, *The Sea*, such are some of the subjects he discusses.

Let no one think, that because these essays have already been given to the public through the pages of a Monthly, they are any the less suitable for a book. The very fact, that they have been published in their present form is an assurance, that they belong to the solid writings of the day—writings that will last. We recommend the book as eminently suitable for a family library. Its reading is all the more pleasant from the form in which the matter is arranged. To be had of SMITH, ENGLISH & Co., No. 23 North Sixth St., Philadelphia.

THE HUMAN INTELLECT; with an introduction upon Psychology and the Soul. By Noah Porter, D. D., Clark Professor of Moral

Philosophy and Metaphysics in Yale College. New York; Charles Scribner & Company. 1868.

This is a huge volume of nearly 700 pages. It might seem at first, that an author could manage to put down in smaller compass what needs to be set before a student on the subject of the human intellect. The students of Rauch's *Anthropology and Psychology*, a volume of about one quarter the dimensions of this volume of Dr. Porter's, would think so. And we think there is a great deal of unnecessary lumber in the book, especially as it is prepared as a text book for Colleges. True, the coarse print in it appropriates only a portion, perhaps the smaller portion, while the remarks and notes are copious, so that the part to be studied for recitation is thus considerably reduced. But we think it would be better to leave some things to be said by the professor, who could better satisfy the wants in the case by oral explanations and criticisms.

Another reason, however, for the extensive size of this treatise is the fact, that the author has combined in it *Psychology and Philosophy or Metaphysics*. As things are in the Colleges of this country this may be desirable. Philosophy as yet has been but little studied. We remember well when all that was studied at Princeton was *Locke on the Human Understanding* and some like empirical treatise on Moral Philosophy or Ethics. In another, a shorter work on Mental Philosophy was all that the students got in Philosophy, which was simply no Philosophy at all. This work of Prof. Porter's gives at least some hints and criticisms of the different systems of Philosophy, and students can look out a little on this world of thought that has engaged the greatest intellects of all ages.

We think it would be better, however, to keep the science of Psychology within its own proper limits, and treat of Philosophy proper in its own field. The two are nearly related, it is true, but they are sufficiently distinct to be studied each in its own field. We have been pleased with the general position of the book, and we regard it as certainly an advance in this department on what has yet been produced in this country.

We regard it as defective, as we do also Rauch's *Psychology*, in that it fails to bring out the Trichotomy of man. It seems remarkable to us, that men should study the nature of body and soul, but shrink from taking into the field of their investigations the *Spirit*. Its existence is a matter of consciousness just as really as that of body or soul, and is just as clearly taught in the Bible. We would not quarrel about nomenclature. But this is clearly a point that concerns more than mere terms.

Neither can we understand why it is, that, in Christian Colleges, and by Christian authors, the light of Christianity is so studiously shut out from such a science. So much is this the case, that it would seem strange to us now to stumble upon a chance quotation from the Word of God in a work on the human soul. Shakspeare is quoted,

but God's word is not. Why is this? Must we be heathen in order to be scientific? One would think, at least, that the revelation made to the world in Christ, that the inspired record of the Bible, would throw some light on the knowledge of man. Why then not freely take and use this light? In reading our text books in the various departments of learning in this age, one would be led to suppose, that the facts of divine revelation are nice enough for fancy, but when you want substantial truth, facts, you must rest only on the intellect of man. Is not this infidelity? Our Psychologies could be raised to a new position by using what is given in the Bible as to man's being. As the word goes, however, this work of Prof. Porter is Christian. We commend it to all who take interest in the subject which it discusses. To be had of Smith, English & Co., No 23 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

ALMS-GIVING: THE TRUE CHRISTIAN MODE. A tract is sometimes as much as a book. Indeed for the people who wish to get the gist of what a man teaches, the prophecy he has to make, without the process through which he has passed in his own mind, it is better than a book. In this age especially is it necessary to send out instruction in brief form. If in addition to this it is considered that many people are not able to buy books on all the important subjects which ought to be brought to their notice, it will appear at once, that the issuing of a tract is an important work for the Church, provided the tract be of the proper character.

The subject of the tract here noticed is one which commends itself to the German Reformed Church. The subject of worship has agitated us for years past, and the subject of Christian benevolence no less. Now what we need is that these two should be properly brought together in one. Is alms-giving a part of worship? We believe it is. It is so regarded in the New Testament. This is forcibly brought out in the tract itself. If then it is a part of worship, as much so as prayer itself, then it belongs properly to the Order of Worship. A place should be provided for it in the regular service of the Lord's day. This provision is made in the Liturgy. Now what we need is, that our people should be brought to see the propriety of presenting their offerings as here provided.

They will thus become regular, and the question of systematic benevolence, as it is sometimes called, will at the same time be answered. *On the first day of the week* was the Apostles' plan. In conjunction with the prayer and praise that are offered at the Altar, these offerings should be presented.

Not only systematic benevolence is here provided for, but a method which will reach all the people. Better this, we think, than any plan which involves mere calculation or resolution on the part of the individual. They will be trained to give every Sunday, and of course at every Communion season. As the Communion is the central service of all our worship, such an occasion will of course

appeal more strongly to the members, and the offerings given then will be large in proportion, only let our ministers attend to the matter, and the people will respond.

The author of the above named Tract is a sufficient guarantee for the matter it presents. It was furnished by the lamented Dr. Harbaugh, as one of the last works of his useful life. It presents the substance of his excellent article on the subject, which appeared in this Review. We cordially commend it for general circulation. To be had of S. R. Fisher & Co., No. 54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia. Price 25 cents per dozen, or \$2.00 per hundred copies.

TABLE PRAYER. TRACT No. 2. This little Tract on an important subject, also commends itself to notice. It very briefly presents the reasons for prayer at the table, and furnishes a number of appropriate forms. The subject of forms of prayer is coming more and more to be regarded in a new light. Especially are they inquired after for family use. Parents, who feel the duty of family prayer pressing upon them, and who yet feel themselves unable properly to discharge it, want just what is here provided. This tract was prepared by the Rev. A. Carl Whitmer. To be had of S. R. Fisher & Co., No. 54 North Sixth Street. Price 75 cents per hundred copies.

THE COTTAGE BY THE LAKE. Translated from the German, by Miss R. H. Schively. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. 1869. Pp. 160.

Germany is world-renowned for its literature. This is true, not only in regard to writings of great profundity and research, but also with respect to those of the lighter kind. Among the latter, the works of M. Claudius occupy a prominent place. They are especially distinguished for their moving pathos and tenderness, and the vein of evangelical piety by which they are pervaded. The Cottage by the Lake possesses all these characteristics, and the happy rendering of it into English by Miss Schively will make it peculiarly acceptable to the general reader. It furnishes a striking exemplification of that explicit trust in an over-ruling providence, for which the Swiss nation are peculiarly distinguished, and which, as in this particular case, greatly alleviates the trials of the present life, and causes them, in the end, to result in much good.